Professor Sue Trinidad >> Okay, I believe the UWA people are still coming, so, do we mind if we just wait a few minutes or do you think that we should?

Audience member >> We can wait a couple minutes.

Professor Joanne Goodell >> Why don’t I give an overview of the programme while we’re waiting for them?

Professor Sue Trinidad >> Yes. Yes, of course, Joanne. Okay, so I'll just start. So, welcome everyone. It's wonderful to have everyone here from the different universities and we've had great pleasure this morning to talk to the American Council of Educators. So, it's the ACE Fellows who have been visiting various universities in Australia. And we have Dr Joanne Goodell, Dr Rosalee Rush and Dr Janelle-

Professor Janelle Chiasera >> Chiasera.

Professor Sue Trinidad >> Chiasera. And so I'm going to hand over to Joanne to just give a little bit of an overview of the ACE Fellows and a little bit of background as to why they're looking at what we're doing here in Australia. So, welcome and thank you.

[OVERVIEW begins at 00:01:02]

Professor Joanne Goodell >> Thanks so much, Sue, for having us. It's been a long time planning. We, I think I emailed Sue maybe in September last year and Louisa, thank you very much. So, the ACE Fellows Programme - ACE is the American Council on Education - has been established for about 60 years I believe. And the Fellows Programme has been going for 50 years. SO, we're actually cohort 51. There are 41 people in the cohort and you spend up to a year engaged in another university, away from your home campus at a host campus. And while you're on that host campus, you're working with senior leadership, usually the president and provost or a senior vice president or something. In, you know, that matches your area of interest and/or expertise. While you're at the host campus, you can work on a variety of different projects as assigned by your mentor. Or you can just be like I was, sitting around in meetings, giving my advice when it was asked for and listening and learning. So, I had a really great year of listening and learning.

It was a very different position to be in, once you've been in a position of responsibility at your home institution, to go somewhere else and be a fly on the wall, was basically where I've been. But everyone's had different roles in their host institution. You also have to do a project for your home institution and we've all done different things. And mine was looking at how to increase the profile of teaching on our campus. Because we've done a lot of things to help improve student success around administrative and advising and other kinds of student support mechanisms but we've not really looked at what goes on in the classroom. I'm a teacher educator. I was a math teacher here in Perth for 13 years before I started doing my PhD. And [inaudible], the people I worked with years ago when I was here at Perth. So, I'm a Perth grad. I have four degrees from Curtin University, one of which was a WAIT course so, that's really old. And so then, so we spent a year at our host institution. We also attend three multiday retreats in various locations. Our first one last year was in Detroit, Michigan. The second one was in Miami and our third one will be in Washington DC, just a week after we all get back.

And we do various, you know, professional development type activities around leadership. We look at budgeting models and, you know, enrollment management trends and how to work on fundraising and, you name it. As a higher ed admin, the issue, we've looked at it in some degree. Also, in depth was a case study of two institutions, a fictional institution and a real institution. A fictional institution is kind of like a stalwart of the programme. It's called Pennyfield College and we all feel like it's a rite of passage for every Fellow to do the Pennyfield case study. So, you're sitting around at midnight on the day before you're supposed to be giving your presentation about Pennyfield with five of your colleagues, wondering how on earth you're going to put all this together. SO, it's that kind of thing. It's really more of a, you know, a morale and camaraderie building kind of activity. But, you know, it has some practical applications as well.

And then the real case study revolves around a college called Marygrove College, which I just found out that Rosalee's mother is an alumni of. Marygrove College is a small, private Catholic institution with an enrollment of about 2,000 students. And like many of those kinds of institutions in the US, they're experiencing some difficulties with enrollment and budget management and so on. And so we as a group, all 41 of us, spent an entire day at the campus talking with their leadership and looking in various different groups at different aspects of the university, so, we’ve had a huge variety of experiences.

This tour is the culminating event for the three of us. We left a colleague in Melbourne. She's gone up to Cairns which she still can't say. She can't say the word Cairns, it's so funny! She's gone up to Cairns with her mother who came on the trip of a lifetime with her daughter to go, come to Australia. So, we visited Sydney and went to Western Sydney as our first stop. We met Barney Glover. Many of you all know from his time here at Curtin. He's the chancellor, vice chancellor there now. Then we went to the University of Technology Sydney and Sydney University for two shorter visits. Then we went to Melbourne and we visited Australian Catholic University and the University of Melbourne one day and the next day we went to Victoria University and Monash. And then we came here yesterday and I'm with you today, for the entire day, which has been fantastic. Because the other visits have been quite short and we haven't had much of a chance to interact with people on a deeper level. So, this has been really excellent and I really thank the National Centre for sponsoring us and helping us put our stay together [inaudible] so far. So, that's about it. [To colleague] Would you like to say something?

Dr Rosalee Rush >> Thank you very much for hosting us today.

Professor Sue Trinidad >> And I'll probably just ask Luke to give you a bit of background on the colleagues who are sitting here, in on this session. Because they're from each of the universities. So, Luke, did you just want to?

Mr Luke Webster >> Sure, yeah. So, my name's Luke. I work here at Curtin University in the Ethics, Equity and Social Justice Office. And we’ve, over the almost two years now have been, we formed a WA collective of equity practitioners. So, linked to the national EPHEA – Equity Practitioners in Higher Education Australasia - body. We've created a WA Committee. So, we meet quarterly to discuss our activities and ways that we can work together to - around raising aspirations of people to attend university. So, it seemed like a great opportunity to kind of combine our collective activities today.

Professor Joanne Goodell >> Thank you. That's excellent. Very good.

Professor Sue Trinidad >> So, we might get started because I know that we're running on a bit of a timeline. So, Joanne, would you like to begin?

[PERFORMANCE BASED FUNDING DISCUSSION begins at 00:07:24]

Professor Joanne Goodell >> Okay, so the three of us are going to talk. Do we… how would we prefer to do this? Should we do the three presentations and then have a general discussion at the end? Would that be better? Okay. So, we'll do that. You know, if there's a specific question that you have just for clarification, please don't hesitate to ask as we go through.

I'll be talking about performance-based funding and its implications for equity students. Janelle's talking about the development of an institutional equity plan that she constructed at her host institution, Clemson University. And Rosalee's talking about emergency communications and her experiences with that at her home institution of Bloomsburg, thank you. Okay, so we're not going to talk for too long. We'll definitely leave you with these slides and you're welcome to use them if you wish. And most of these do give sort of a high-level overview just to start some conversation around these issues. So, that's me.

But just to give you an idea of the trends in funding sources and where the money comes from in the US. As you can see, there are three basic pots of money that universities get in the United States. Tuition, state and local appropriations. And federal appropriations including grants and contracts. They're the three main big pots of money. You can see there that the state and local appropriations have been going down precipitously at all types of institutions. Across the top of the four different categories of institutions that we usually look at in the US, those are institutions that grant doctoral degrees and everything else. Institutions that grant up to a master's degree or up to a bachelor's degree or a two-year institution. We call those community colleges.

But you can see at each type of institution, the percentage of state funding has been going down over the past 10 years. When I first started at my home institution, we were actually over 40%. We were 50% and we are a doctoral granting institution. And this year, I think we're down to about 24% of our funding coming from the state appropriations. You'll see that the other two pots of money are kind of static. So, you know, what goes up, comes down or whatever the saying may be. But because these state appropriations are going down, the biggest impact of course on our students is that tuition is going up. And that's been consistent over all those sectors, as I mentioned.

So, what are some of the state-funded models that are used? Most institutions previously were on a “base and plus or minus” kind of model. So, there was an amount that was allocated based on a particular kind of formula. And then when you get additions or subtractions on that based on how you met those targets in the formula. In 1979, Tennessee was the first institution to introduce performance-based funding. And it took quite a while for Ohio, which is the state I work in, to jump on board in 1995 with some performance-based measures. And followed quite a long time again after that by Indiana in 2007. Most of those programmes, all of those programmes in that period were termed performance funding 1.0, where they provided a bonus on top of regular funding. So, they were just some performance targets that universities could choose to meet or not. And then they would get a little bit extra based on whether they met those targets or not.

Now, we've all moved to performance funding 2.0 where the money that you receive from the state is pretty much all based on the meeting of these equity or these metrics or these performance targets. I think Tennessee is actually nearly up to 100% performance based funding now. By June of 2014, 26 states had some level of performance funding. And now it's 36 and it's increasing. So, I think, you know, it's like the copycat kind of thing. You know, the policy papers will say the same thing. It spreads gradually from one to the other and they look from one state to the next. So, unlike Australia, you know, these states have a lot of say in the policies at the state level for universities. Because they are all, they're legislated within the state. There are very few-

>> Are there any national universities? I don't think there are.

Professor Joanne Goodell >> There's no national university.

So, the old models were all based on inputs. So, in Australian vernacular, it was “bums on seats”. You've got a student, you've got a dollar from the state, or however many dollars.

[Additional colleagues enter the room]

Professor Joanne Goodell >> Oh, I'm so sorry, we kind of just started without you.

Audience member >> That's okay.

Professor Joanne Goodell >> There's some seats there and some seats in the back.

So, I'm just talking about performance funding in the US and giving a little bit of background about some of those models and how they've been developed over the last some years. So, yeah, so the old models were all based on inputs. So, the number of students, the instructional costs, how much it costs to maintain the plant, the capital improvements that were needed and so on. And these were all tried for and dished out on sometimes an equitable and sometimes an inequitable basis.

The move toward performance funding is an attempt I think to try and even out the playing field in some regard, to develop, to divide up the fundings in a different way. Now with performance funding metrics, most of them are based on course completion. So, that means in our language, a grade of A, B or C and no grades of D, which is considered below par. Or F, which is fail or W which is withdraw. So, the student, the money's only awarded if the student receives a grade A, B or C in the course. So, you know, if you think about that as a faculty member and as a college or a partner, they have huge implications for what goes on in the classroom and changes the, you know, changes the game really quite considerably in terms of what you do and how you treat your students and, you know, how students can progress through their courses.

What they are also based on are graduation rates. And just to give you some idea, when I first started at Cleveland State, there were no performance funding models. As I said, we had a very small amount of it. But there was no focus on graduation rates or retention rates and there was no conversation about it at the university. No one ever mentioned it and no one knew what the numbers are. And I will talk a little bit about that in more detail later. Retention rates, retention is usually measured between the first and second year of college. So everyone is really working hard now so to improve those retention rates, to keep the first-year students. So, obviously there's a lot of focus on what happens to students now in that first year. And how prepared they are for the university studies or not has a big impact on how they are retained. And in some states, employment rates are also used. Our colleague, Kim, who is not with us today, mentioned it a number of times in other conversations we've had. That when you ask a legislator what is success for a university, how do you measure that, they will say, the number of graduates employed after one year out of college. That's what they're interested in. They want to know how many people are getting jobs straight out of programmes and what jobs programmes are leaning to. So, that's causing a lot of consternation in the liberal arts because not every degree leads to a job and not every programme is a professionally-focussed programme.

So, you know, there's a lot of conversation going on around all of those things because of this switch to performance-based funding. So, just to give you an idea. That was a graph I found the other day. The green are implementing as of FY2015, if my glasses are helping me read that far. Is that correct?

Audience member >> Yes.

Professor Joanne Goodell >> Developing are the blue states and the grey ones, there's nothing happening in these terms there. But you can see it's very widespread and I'm sure before long it'll be across the entire US.

So the state, this is taken from the state of Ohio's policy implementation rationale and how the state has said it's going to and why it wants to implement performance-based funding. Firstly, they have tried I think to engage stakeholders across the state in having input onto how the metrics are developed. There's a group of university presidents within Ohio. There are 14 state universities. Only the state universities get state funding, by the way. The privates do not get state funding. So, this money is coming from the state to the state-funded universities. So, there's 14 of those in the state of Ohio. And they meet regularly once every couple of months. And this is obviously a big topic of discussion and there's a lobbyist who lobbies the state legislature on behalf of the 14 presidents. And a lot of that lobbying is around how the metrics are developed and how they are implemented. So, you know, the political nature of this is obvious because the money's coming from the legislature. And every extra bit of money is that is allocated could be coming to your campus. So, it's in your interest to do that.

Professor Joanne Goodell >> They do use a limited set of consistently defined metrics, so that everyone's held to the same standard. Which may or may not be equitable, depending on how you choose to define equity. There is differentiation across each institution with their different missions and their different populations. So, there are some mechanisms within it to try to, to try and compensate for institutions like my institution, which is, or was an open access, completely open access - that means no entrance requirements. We now have some entrance requirements but the vast majority of our students are extremely low socioeconomic status. And many of them first gen students. So, you know, our population is very different to Ohio State University which is in Columbus. It's actually a land grant university who now say, you know, their entry requirements have gone up considerably because they want to keep their population at around about 60,000 to 70,000 students. So, you know, we're in the growth phase. We don't want to, you know, we're not restricting our enrollment at all. As long as they meet some fairly basic admission requirements. But, you know, there are some mechanisms built in with the course. We would argue that they could be more friendly to us because of the nature of our student body. They do try to focus on student completion by incentivising the success of at-risk students. So, there are some, also some bonuses in there if you like for being more successful with the at-risk student.

All, or most of our funding now, I couldn't find the actual percent but it's something like 60% of our state funding is based on these metrics. But when, of course when it changed, that was a big change and some of us stood to lose a bit and some of us stood to lose a lot. Other stood to gain a lot because of the change in the way it went. So, they did have a phase in period and they did have some hold harmless dollars so that, you know, if your institution was going to be significantly impacted in a negative way, there was some bridge funding to ease that transition until everyone caught up with and got on board with the new ways of funding and being able to, you know, develop those programmes and policies in the university to improve their outcomes.

So, there has been some attempt to ease the impact on the institutions as they've gone through. So, in Ohio, we've got 40% of degree completion. We've got 50% degree completion I should say, 30% course completion. About, you know, 19.7 for doctoral student programmes as they're served… in additional funding on top of that. And 0.3% set aside for special projects. And that's how they've divided it up in Ohio.

But what have been some of the implications for the institutions? And I'm talking generally now across the entire, you know, all of the institutions. So, because of this pot of money, it's always a zero sum game. If I win, you lose. You know, so there's, that creates even more competition between the institutions. There’s been a lot of programme prioritisation, which means looking at every programme, looking at its outputs and determining those ones that are not helping us on our performance metrics and perhaps closing those programmes down. So, what do you do with the faculty? What happens to the students? What happens to the facilities. So, there's a lot of implications, you know, that are playing out in that regard.

Programmes with low enrolment, low graduation numbers and low job placement rates, you know, stand to be eliminated. And you think, it doesn't take too long to think of what kinds of programmes they might be. You know, they may not be job focussed. They may be nonprofessional-type programmes. You know, with a much stronger liberal arts focus. So, that's under real pressure from this performance funding. Those programmes are feeling the pinch. And we’ve certainly amalgamated and eliminated some of our religious studies and philosophy programmes at my university. Which I don't think is a good thing. So these, you know, and then you looked out to, past the programme level to the course level.

Professor Joanne Goodell >> So, courses that aren't required for graduation are being eliminated so that they, you know, lessens the choice of students. It lessens the breadth of their education. And that, you know, that may or may not be a good thing but, you know, these are just some of the implications that are occurring as a result of these complications.

Courses considered roadblocks like mathematics might be diminished, might, you know, be really heavily scrutinised. Maybe the quality will diminish. Maybe the quality of the degree will diminish. We don't know the answers to these questions yet because these really hard level, as I would call serious performance-based funding initiatives, have only been in for a couple of years and we're not really seeing the impact and very little research has been done around some of these questions that I'm raising here. Which is where some of you might be interested in looking.

Like I say, I think I already mentioned. Some institutions have increased admission requirements to keep out low SES or unqualified students which obviously impacts our equity students. The increasing emphasis on course and degree completion is probably a good thing. And I fact, the data would suggest that there have been, you know, a big increase in the number of degrees awarded in Ohio since this came into fruition, into being. But again, that could also be impacted by a lot of other factors as well. So that the research is nascent here. It really needs a lot more, you know, research so we can really understand what's going on.

Obviously if you're receiving pressure to increase your completion rate in courses, you may be also thinking about decreasing your standards. For the most part, there hasn't been any check on that. People and institutions have relied on the faculty to maintain those standards. And that may be okay if you have an institution with a large number of full-time faculty but for many of us, we have a lot of part-time faculty who, not that their standards and quality are any less, but when you are dealing with a large number of sessional staff teaching in a programme where there may be a lot of turnover of those staff, it's very hard, even in normal times, to maintain quality. And if you're being told we've got to get as many students through as possible or we're going to lose funding, you know, that message, whether it be forceful or subliminal, is there and I think there's a real danger in that regard.

On the good side, Ohio now gets 4000 students…er, $4000 per student who graduates. That's one number. Of course that number fluctuates depending on the pool of money. But it's been around that which has led some institutions to look at students who don't graduate for very small amounts of debt to the university. And that happens a lot more than we as faculty and administrators knew about. Some students would not graduate for a debt of $300. It may all be parking fines. You know, are we going to hold a student back from graduating because they had a parking, problem with parking? Well, you know, now we've introduced and there’s been a lot of work around that from some of the foundations, this idea of completion rates. So, you know, the university can and – the university I've been at, Kent State University is my host institution, the president set aside $200,000 - no, $300,000 next year - for completion rates. But partly as a result of my pushing them that it was one of the things I, you know, I think you should be doing this. I think you should be doing completion rates. Completion grants are a really good idea. Here's all this information from the Lumina Foundation. Here's all this information from… you know, so while I wasn't specifically involved in doing that programme, I provided the input and they were very happy. The provost in particular was thrilled that he was able to convince the president based on information I've provided them, that the completion rate was a good idea. So, those kinds of things are happening and I think that's a very good thing for some of our equity students. And for all students who are in that position.

Professor Joanne Goodell >> We made a big push on advising. So, when I first started at the university, we had very few professional advisors. Most of the course and career advising was done by faculty to, you know, to in some cases, a very high standard and in some cases to a very poor standard. And so students were often led down the wrong path with poor advice about what courses to take or no advice, and taking the wrong courses of their own, because they didn't know. So, you know, they didn't read the handbook or the, you know, the course manual or whatever it was. And we did away with compulsory advising – we didn't really have enough people. Now of course because of completion and degree completion in particular is such a big focus, a lot of effort has been put into that, into advising. Still, there are still issues around advising because those professional advisors don't have to have any licence or any, there's no, you know, level of degree required. I mean, some of them have Master's in Counselling. Some of them hold PhD's in counselling. So, you know, the quality is very uneven. There’s some great ones and some that, you know, certainly are not so great, just as there were in faculty. But for the most part, the students are getting a lot better advice on what classes to take when and how to navigate through the model, I think for the most part, curriculums in the United States' universities.

And then the other thing that's happening is that there are now for-profit companies set up to analyse each university's data when you’ve paid them $150,000 for the privilege of doing so that will give back to the university the early warning signs of students who are likely to drop out. So, they'll take, the university, my host institution Kent State, this is exactly what has happened. So, they hand over their university data set of all of their student records with all of the demographic information about every student and every course completion and every enrollment and withdrawal. And you know, the whole, everything. Give it to this company called EAB, Education Advisory Board. And they do their magic and they send back, you know, lists of students. Or groups of students who are in danger of, you know, dropping out of this course or dropping out of that programme or not making it to the end or, you know, all of those things. And they, that information is given to the advisors and then the advisors have to have the conversation with the student. Well, there's a whole other level of advising that goes on then too, because what do you do when you call a student into your room and you say, “Oh, we've been given an early warning about that you're going to drop out.” Hmm. That might be a bit, you know, disconcerting for a student to hear that they're on a target list of drop outs. So, you know, there's a whole lot more work that has to go on with advisors to make sure that the messaging is, you know, sent and received correctly in terms of these kinds of advice, advising interactions. A couple of the institutions that we, did you go to Georgia State?

Dr Rosalee Rush >> Yes.

Professor Joanne Goodell >> So, Georgia State is a famous institution that's done a lot of work in this area along with Arizona State and I visited both of those as part of my fellowship just a couple weeks back. At Georgia State, they have 800 indicators that they analyse about every student every night. Their computers run every night analysing these indicators. So, if you put in as an advisor that you saw student X today and they said something like, you know, well, you know, my mother's really sick and I might have to take some time off. That goes into the data system and that's counted in the, you know. So, then if the student is absent the next week, then that goes into the data system and, you know, then if the student doesn't hand in an assignment the next week, that goes into the data system. And then, you know, then the advisor goes, hang on. Sick. Absent. Null assignment.

Professor Joanne Goodell >> This student's in trouble. I should contact that student. I should reach out to that student. And that happens every single day. And so they have, you know, they have so much information and so much analytics going on about every student every day. They have been able to just make incredible strides with their retention and completion at Georgia State. So, if you really want to know about how to do it well, go look at Georgia State because they have done incredible work, along with Arizona State, who is the biggest university now in the United States. They have 70,000 on campus students and 20,000 completely online students. Their student population is 90,000 students. And their mantra from their president is we will be known by the students we enrol, not the students we keep out. So, he's made, you know, his thing is innovate and grow, rather than let's stay static and only take the students who meet our standards and let's keep raising our standards so we keep all those other ones out.

You know, so there's some fascinating things going on.

So, just a very quick little bit about Cleveland State. So, when I first started, the graduation rate was never discussed. It was a dirty little secret that we were actually the lowest of all of the 14 state universities in Ohio. I think it was something like 25%, so that means only 25% of the students who started graduated within six years. Not four years. The four-year graduation rate was something like 10% or less, 9%. So, when we got a new president in 2009 and we were transitioning into this performance-funded model with the metrics based on the performance of first-time full-time freshman, that's what FTFTF means. He really brought the focus on the student success. And we formed an undergraduate community around student success with faculty and administrators. And those people worked very closely with the registrar, the bursar and the financial aid office to make sure that any kind of administrative barrier was removed. Any kind of graduation, barrier to graduation was removed as much as possible, so that everyone really, you know, people really benefitted from that.

We implemented web-based degree-ordered software so the students can now go in and see exactly which courses they've got that they've completed and which they have to, still have to complete to see where they are. We implemented degree maps so that everyone knows this is the best way to take these courses. So, you know, in this sequence. And as a result, we've improved our graduation rates by quite a lot. I think we're up to almost 40% now. So, another thing we did also, which was a very big thing, and it was during my tenure as faculty senate president, was to realign our entire curriculum. So, we changed it from 128 credits required for a degree to 120 credits required for a degree and changed it from a basically 4-credit model to a 3-credit model so that we are more in line with the entire country, which also runs on a 3-credit model.

But it wasn’t without controversy. We had quite a number of very heated meetings which I had to chair. And we had a vote of no confidence in the president and the administration, which the president reminded me about just a couple of weeks ago and I had a laugh with him. So, it's a very sore point for him but we did it and we did it in one year. And that convinced me that when we really need to do something, we actually did it. And it's been of great benefit to the students. We did lose some tuition in that first year because of the changes but now with this graduation rate of almost 40%, I think we've really shown that those things have made a big difference to our students and hopefully will continue to do so.

Professor Joanne Goodell >> My project was for my home institution I think I mentioned was [inaudible] focus on teaching. Because while we've done all of those things, most of them have been focussed on students and what happens to students outside of the classroom. We haven't focussed on what happens to students inside of the classroom. And I was with Shirley Alexander. She said the other day at UTS, the biggest thing she felt that she did was at the beginning of her tenure as DVC Academic was to change the conversation from teaching to learning. And what is happening to students while they're learning in the classrooms. Not what you are doing as teachers but how are the students learning? And that's definitely something I'm taking back. Not that it wasn't my focus but this, that really has convinced me that that needs to be our focus. So, that's it. Thank you.

Professor Sue Trinidad >> Thank you.

[ Applause ]

Dr Rosalee Rush >> I think it's important to also note that with Georgia State University, they completely revised their advisor structure. They had professional advisors. They also looked at what is the group or the subpopulation of students that they could be most effective with. And so they called it the “murky middle”. So, they didn't go after every group or student population on campus. They went to that group that they could really make a change with and they started to grow from there.

[DEVELOPING AN INSTITUTIONAL EQUITY PLAN DISCUSSION begins at 00:35:53]

Professor Janelle Chiasera >> Okay, I'm going to turn the conversation just a little bit from performance-based funding although there are some implications for an equity plan on campuses. But focus a lot on developing an institutional equity plan. There's my information up there for you if any of you have any questions. My email is there. I am at the University of Alabama at Birmingham which is my home institution. It's a research-intensive public university with an academic health centre associated with it. And I am being hosted by Clemson University, which is a public institution that's a land grant institution. So, very, very little academic health on that campus. A lot more agriculture and [inaudible] on that campus.

So, I always think it's important to start out with definitions. Definitions because it can be a little murky for you to understand kind of where we're coming from when we talk about things like diversity and inclusion and equity. So, I wanted to start out by just defining some of those terms. So, for diversity across the country, what people in the United States often confuse this with is the fact that it's a black and white issue. And in America, it's really not. In the United States right now, it's much more comprehensive. It's much more complex than that. So, we're really talking about diversity meaning individual differences within our students, our faculty and our staff. And also group social differences that can be engaged in the service of learning across our campuses. And so that can include things like personality differences, learning style differences, sexual orientation, ability status as well as a whole host of others like political, religious and other affiliations that students have.

Professor Janelle Chiasera >> Inclusion, on the other hand, is more about kind of this intentional engagement that we have with diversity on our campus in the people that we hire and the students that we have. In our curriculum. In our co-curricular activities. And as well in our communities in which people connect. And people connect in order to increase awareness. To increase content knowledge. To increase cognitive sophistication. And to understand and have empathy for one another. And the complex nature of what those relationships really look like.

So, when I think about diversity inclusion on US, in US institutions, diversity really is about numbers. It's about the number of people, faculty, staff and students that we can bring to our campus and inclusion is about the climate and the culture that we build. And there was a great article I read about a year ago where they actually differentiated between those two as diversity being all about being invited to the party and inclusion being all about being asked to dance when you're at the party. And those are not mutually exclusive. And on US campuses, we cannot keep these separate. And that's because there have been situations where people have increased their numbers of diverse student, diverse faculty, diverse staff. They did not include the inclusion piece and lost those people within three years' time. So, all the effort and energy and money that went into it really didn't do much good for that institution.

So, those are really together.

For equity, this is really about creating opportunities on our campuses to help students from under-represented populations, have equal access to and participation in allowing the educational programmes that we have on our campus. So, I just wanted to make sure that we understood what that is. As an academic, I always feel like it's important for you to understand the historical context of US higher ed. And that we really have been working on this forever. And I will tell you, we don't have a magic bullet here. So while Joanne talked a lot about some people that are doing some best practices, in the field of diversity and equity, there really isn't a best practice that exists. Often what we do is we look at a few other institutions as far as what they're doing and we tweak what they do to fit the culture that exists in our institution. And that's what's different from something like performance-based funding versus something like diversity, which is very much part of the culture of an institution.

So in the, for the nearly 400-year history that we've had in higher education, the primary purpose over those years was primarily at the purview of the elite. So, it's really about the haves getting the education and the have-nots not getting the education that is out there. And it wasn't until 1869 when a gentleman named Charles Elliott who actually was the president of Harvard, actually created this paradigm of education that pretty much exists today in US higher education. And that his vision really shifted American higher education from a pedagogy that was really steeped in kind of this recitation and classical Greek and Latin training to this education model that works on the electives system of courses that really exists in American public population now. And that probably is little bit similar to what you have here in Australia.

In the 1800s, we had women's colleges that actually started way back in the early 1800s as well as African-American institutions. And in fact, one of those institutions started back in 1854 which was the Ashman Institute which is now called Lincoln University. That had its charter from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in 1854. And it was therefore the first degree granting, what we call historically black college and university that we had. So, way back then, Wilberforce University was, it has its history traced before the civil war. So, I'm also to talk about the Civil War here in a minute.

Professor Janelle Chiasera >> So, their history, Wilberforce University started before the Civil War, when the Ohio underground railroad was started. And this was a railroad where Blacks from the South were seeking refuge up north. And so they were using these underground railroads and one of the stops was Wilberforce University, which was really an institutional Mecca and refuge from slavery’s first rule, which was ignorance.

So, this is a great way to kind of move against that kind of mantra. So, in the early 1800s, this was the first time that they really started altering the view of US higher education only being for white males when they started these women colleges as well as the African-American, the historically black colleges in the United States in 1800s.

The 1800s also, in the mid-1800s saw a danger boost to American higher education at that time with something called the moral land grant act. And there were two land-grant acts. There was one in 1862 which was called the land-grant College act and there was another one in 1890 toward the bottom of the slide which was called the Agricultural College Act of 1890. A lot of people believe that this is where US higher education became democratised. But it’s not, that's not quite the case where it exists. It became more utilitarian in nature than it was democratised. And I'll talk a little bit about that here.

So, the land-grant College act was started by a congressman out of Vermont. His name was Justin Smith Moral. And it was signed by Abraham Lincoln on July 2, 1862. And what this act did was it provided grants to each state, 30, it provided them 30,000 acres of public land in each state per senator and per representative. And what the states did at that time was they sold that land and then they created an endowment. And within each state, they were supposed to at least build one college within that state. And off to the right it tells you really what the reason for the endowment really was, to support the maintenance of a least one college where the leading object shall be toward the bottom to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes and the several pursuits and professions in life. So, this really not only provided an institution that helped what I say, what I think is more democratising higher education. But it really kept that shift from the classical studies to the applied studies, moving forward.

A lot of these land grants institutions focussed very hard on agriculture, which at that time, about 60% to 70% of people were engaged in agriculture. And the whole identity around those institutions was to take that theory and get it out in the farmlands. Now, in 2009, 2015, I think we're down at about 2%. So, we're thinking about our value from a real different setting. Since that first land-grant act, 69 colleges were funded through that first land-grant act. And I put it, a bullet on here that said the land-grant act has improved the lives of millions of people. And what I should've done was put a couple of question marks after that. Because I think yes, it did improve the lives of millions of Americans but what we have to understand is very early on the Civil War was going on and there was kind of this separation of races. So, in the South in the United States, this was a time where Blacks were not allowed to attend those institutions that were built off that first land-grant. So, to counteract that, the 1890 land-grant act came up and that was called the Agricultural College Act of 1890. And this was specifically aimed at the southern Confederate states. Saying you're going to do one of two things. You're either going to show that race is not an admission criteria with the land-grant institutions that exist right now or the second thing is you're going to designate a separate land-grant institution for persons of colour. That were separate but equal is what they had called them. So, that separate land-grant act actually resulted in the development of 17 historically black colleges and universities in the Confederate states. And today there's probably about, I just looked this up, and 105 land-grant institutions that exist right now.

Professor Janelle Chiasera >> And what's very interesting about this is the Justin Smith Morrill is someone who never really had a college degree at all. So, the person who started democratising higher education and allowing it to be available for the majority - I don't even really want to say the majority - but for a lot of people across the US actually didn't have a college degree himself.

So, there are a lot of people that argue about whether or not the Morrill Act really resulted in democratising higher ed. I think it's more utilitarian in nature. It took that education and made it based in what they call extension units where you can get that theory out into practice. It wasn't until the 1920s when higher education was identified as a period where education was pretty much democratised at this time. So, it went from being education for the elite in the 1920s to mass public education. In the 1960s, if any of you remember the 60s, I know in the United States we remember the 60s well. This brought a whole new group of students to campus that were politically charged. And so these people on campus actually had a voice and started to protest. And basically this is where you first started to see this breakdown between the barrier of higher education and political issues that exist in the US. These students were socially concerned students and they were loud about it at that time. So, they challenged higher education to broaden its mission. So, even though we think it had a broader mission, they really challenged higher education and brought that mission to address what we considered at that time to be America's complex social problems. And that really focussed around race and minority status issues.

We had of course in the 1960s a civil rights movement that existed. And I will tell you during this period of time when you think that higher education and things that are happening in the landscape, you often think about it from the standpoint of an impact that it has on higher ed. And I will tell you that higher education did not address the deeper implication of race on campus during this time, even though there was a lot of racial tensions that were going on at that time.

In 1975, title IX regulations became effective as law. Some of you may have heard of title IX. Title IX really says no person in the United States shall on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of or be subjected to discrimination under any education programme or activity in the United States that receives federal financial assistance. It wasn't really until the 1980s, although they were pretty active in the 1960s, it really wasn't until the 1980s when race became a major issue. It became a major issue in the intergroup relations that existed on our campuses, in the curriculum that we offer, in the professoriates that we had and the allocation of resources that we had on our campuses. And basically from the 1980s on, it really moved us to this period where we saw this diversity divide, or what we call a diversity divide in the United States. Which is really this disjuncture between rhetoric of inclusion on our campuses and what is actually existing our campuses.

So, today there's still this growing disconnect between higher education and diversity. And what's interesting is this issue that's going on right now. We are having serious demographic changes in the United States where as soon as 2025, 2050, we will have a minority majority in our demographics in the United States, which we haven't seen before. The problem is we have a cultural lag. There's been radical changes in the environment around us from a democratic perspective, but on campuses we have not seen that same radical change in the climates that we have on our campuses. And this is what's leading to serious issues on campuses across the country. And I just actually I could've spent an hour showing you examples of racial tensions that exist for all groups.

Professor Janelle Chiasera >> Whether it be LGBTQ, which is the lesbian, gay, trans, bisexual community as well as minority groups, women. I could've, you know, spent an hour talking about that. I just had a few examples that are actually on the slide there.

So, I will tell you that last two years in higher education in the United States, this has been really a fire point for a lot of presidents here. There are a lot of presidents and chancellors in systems who've lost their job over racial tensions that existed. And a lot of it is because of the failure to communicate or failure to listen and act on what people are asking for. So, I want to show you just a little movie here. This is one of our PhD students at Clemson University. He graduated this May with a PhD in rhetoric. And this is actually going to give you an example of some of the racial tensions that actually exist on campus. If you know anything about higher education, we're really into our college athletics. So, on Clemson's campus, it’s no different. So, we're really big into football, really big into basketball. And the point that you're going to see AV Carson making here is that at Clemson University, our mascot is the tiger. And the tiger is kind of an orange colour with stripes. All the focus on Clemson's campus right now is about the orange. And what members from the African-American population are saying is, what makes up a full tiger is the orange and the black stripes. So, what they're really fighting for right now is that the University start to focus on the stripes. So, AV Carson came up with this poem as well as a little story called See the Stripes, so you can get kind of a sense of what's going on on US campuses.

[Discussion pauses at 00:52:07]

[See youtube <https://youtu.be/tl1cSgbnZTo> - 00:06:06 long video, transcribed below]

>> [Background music] The sight of the most exciting 25 seconds in college football was made possible by profits from the most shameful centuries of America's history. But come to the campus of Clemson University and you'd hardly be able to tell it from looking around.

Solid orange you'll see. The grounds are perfectly manicured, alluring, and monuments to the greatness that creates such institutions stand as reminders from whence we came. And since we gained so much from what we see, we smile. Proud of the great tradition from which we have benefitted, saying we are now a part. Solid orange we are. And it's easy to buy in. It starts with the song that shakes the southland. And a sea of solid orange, tiger rags that kind of grab you and say, You are now a member of this family. You are now a Clemson tiger. Wear your orange proudly. But it's a pretty well-known fact that tigers have stripes and are almost as well known as the reason they do yet Clemson University, home of the tigers, doesn't do much acknowledging of those dark marks it knows to be so integral a part of its existence. Solid orange, we say.

At this university that was once a plantation, slavery being the positive good, according to Master Calhoun, whose house sits still on a plot atop a hill overlooking the football field. Open seven days a week and I can even enter through the front door. What I cannot do, however, is depend on the tour guide to give me the whole history of the foundations of my university because, for some reason or another, it's uncomfortable for some people to talk about slave owners, supremacists and segregationists on those terms. Or it's unknown to the individual responsible for the dissemination of information about this place.

But 20 score and many more years ago, our forefathers brought forth on this continent our forefathers and our foremothers and exploited them for hundreds of years which led to our being conceived in captivity and dedicated to the proposition that history is a matter of telling the story that makes us look best. Solid orange I think.

And that forces me to confront my active participation in not only the crime but the cover up. The whitewashing with orange of the dark parts of the history led to be instructional lest we repeat it. And I repeatedly walk past the Strom Thurmond Institute of Government and Public Affairs and wonder, Was it there that our ancestors were whipped? Because it happened. Slavery was big business and being black meant you made profits to keep your Master in the black. And if the master went into the red, he would see red and you’d likely wear red stripes across your back. Fact. And if that is an uncomfortable truth for the institution, so be it. These are the stripes we bear. So, see them.

Slavery, sharecropping and convict labour pave the streets and sidewalks of this high seminary of learning and earning a degree from here tethers me to the legacy of that. And John C Calhoun, Strom Thurmond, Thomas Green Clemson and “Pitchfork” Ben Tillman with his henchmen, killed black members of a militia, never to be convicted but elected to public office of governor, to have statues and buildings erected in his honour eventually. The one on this beautiful campus houses the Calhoun honours college and the school of education. So be it if it’s uncomfortable to bear those stripes. See them.

Because it’s not uncomfortable to reap the benefits of the labor that went into building the buildings and tending the land, very much so knowing the buildings and the land are stained with years upon years of blood, sweat and tears of slaves and sharecroppers and so-called criminals who were led to the institution to do the work that needed doing. Solid orange, they say.

And I say the tiger cannot survive without its stripes. We cannot ignore the troubling history that brought us to this our glorious institution with its memorials and monuments to honourable men and call ourselves a family. And we're damned if we think we’re doing ourselves any favours colouring the history one hue. One you, one me, one he, one she, one them, will be one us, til we strive to see those stripes. The tiger cannot survive without them.

The site of the most exciting twenty five seconds in college football was made possible by profits from the most shameful centuries in America's history.

Those are the stripes we bear. And before you decide to wear that orange tee or that painted paw, think for a moment about those stripes. Think of the backs of the slaves. Think about the strips of land and the sharecroppers tied to it after the so-called emancipation. Think of the uniform of that 13-year-old boy, a slave of the state, forced to help build the first buildings at the place. Think of the dark matters that matter more than you know, the difference between willing ignorance and active participation, complicit denial and abject perpetuation. Before you think solid orange, think of how ridiculous the solid orange tiger would look. Think of seeing its stripes. Think of being its stripes. And think of how terrible it is to not be seen. To not be acknowledged. Think about never being doomed to repeat an atrocious history and being better because of knowing better and doing better. Because as things are now, we are the tigers built on a legacy of slavery, sharecropping and convict labour. By slave owners, supremacists and segregationists. But come to the campus of Clemson University, and you'd hardly be able to tell it from looking around. And it's a shame. We'd be a beautiful tiger if only we could see our stripes.

[Ends]

[Discussion recommences at 00:58:09]

Professor Janelle Chiasera >> So, quite moving.

An incredible testament to what people are feeling across our campuses in the United States. It's about, thank you, it's about not being heard. It's about not being listened to. It's not acknowledging. It's not understanding. And... Thank you.

So, this is what happened this year in April. We had a national sit in where students were sleeping out on the, this is the front steps of the president's office. And students slept out for nine days asking for demands. And this happened. It was a nationwide sit-in because of the racial tensions that exist in the US and because there are demands that aren't being met and action not being taken. So, this is Clemson's campus where the sit-in took place nine nights. And here's what happened from that. In fact, the slide's a little bit old. I should say this clipping is a little bit old. It's actually 85 universities. So, student groups from 85 universities across the nation made demands to their senior administration on their campuses. And what they said is we need more diverse faculty. We need more diverse student body. We need to improve ethnic studies departments. We need an administrative apology. Our students were actually asked for acknowledgement from our senior administration. And just said would you just acknowledge that we're here and we're out here. Removal of school leaders if there's no action on creating an inclusive environment. Improve mental health services. Zero tolerance for hate speech. And diversity training.

And I will tell you during the nine days it was there, because I was also housed in that same building, I actually witnessed people driving by, yelling out expletives and awful, hateful things to students who were out there just trying to be heard. So, it's an interesting time in US higher education. So, this is how many diverse faculty students demands among our American universities were put out. In just that short period of time in April, when they did that national sit in, and I will tell you that this is actually paralysing some presidents across campus because they don't know how to respond to this. And often they're afraid to say something. This is where it's going to become important when you hear about crisis management. There is a time to respond and there's the right thing to say.

And I think presidents are struggling with that right now. Some have lost their jobs because they either didn't respond, they didn't do so in a timely manner or it was just inappropriate, the way that they did it.

So, what I'm going to focus on now is, so I hope I set the stage for you a little bit about the context of racial tensions, diversity and when we've been doing, kind of the issue that's going on right now. Really, there has been this call to action on universities across campus. And I will tell you, we do not have a magic bullet here. Everybody's kind of doing their own thing and trying to do what's best at their institution. But there are a set of recommendations that universities actually can do. And there's a set of bullets up here that can tell you exactly what we looked at on Clemson's campus. It's really knowing who your community is and who your community is going to be. So, there's an awareness piece there. Just like you saw in that See the Stripes. See the Stripes is all about we're ignored, ignoring the history of Clemson University and how it was built. And people are saying just know who your community is and who we want to attract in the future. Commit to very frank, hard dialogues that exist.

We had three open forums on day seven, when the students slept out on the front steps of the building. We had three open forums and I was amazed and moved by what people had to say in a room with the senior leadership there about how uncomfortable they felt. How unwanted they felt and how unvalued they felt as people from diverse backgrounds. It was very moving.

Professor Janelle Chiasera >> You need to invest in culturally competent practices and I'll show you how we did this on our campus. Second, monitor those goals and make sure that you align resources towards it. Here's the problem at Clemson University. They had a chief diversity officer. I'll talk a little bit about the structure that we have. We have chief diversity officers and chief diversity offices that actually managed a lot of this. They had a chief diversity officer with no direct line to the president and no budget. That means that it's not a priority. That's where the issue lies at Clemson University. That has all changed, but that resource piece is really important. And in fact, there are some universities right now who have dedicated $50 million to reverse what's going on from a diversity and equity standpoint. So, universities are putting huge amounts of money to try to backtrack some of the issues that are going on here.

So, development and pursue a clear vision goal for diversity and inclusive excellence. Expect your students to produce signature work that is around inclusive excellence. So, that can be senior research papers, that can be internship experiences. That can be working within communities to provide them some experiences. Provide support to students to help them divide, er, develop guiding plans for completion. So, along the lines of what Joanne actually talked a lot about, to make sure that we take students in who are diverse and from different backgrounds but create a plan so they can be successful doing that. Identify high impact practices. That's what HIP is, high impact practices suited for your institution. It's not one-size-fits-all.

Ensure essential learning outcomes and high impact practices are incorporated across the curriculum and make student achievement for all visible and valued so that people know exactly where we stand.

So, from an infrastructure perspective, this varies greatly. And I'll tell you, in my research when I was doing the strategic planning framework, there's really, you can put it into two buckets. It's either centralised or decentralised. A lot of US institutions have a centralised office that has a chief diversity officer and an office, that's usually called the office of equity inclusion or diversity equity inclusion or some form of that. This chief diversity officer has a direct line to the president. And that is incredibly important for someone in this office. They have a centralised vision and mission. They have a set of metrics that they want to meet. They have a set of outcomes and there's a budget that's aligned to those particular metrics.

One of the issues that I saw with this model was that the University as a whole will rest their entire diversity platform on the shoulders of that one person or that one office. So, it doesn't really truly get enrollment into the culture of what that University is. So, what some universities have opted to do in the United States is take this decentralised approach, where the efforts are really driven from within units. And I think what you call them here are faculties. So, that can mean that the onus is on the faculty as opposed to this one unit.

So, there is in the faculties, there would be faculty champions with a diversity advisory board that actually reports directly to the president. Often there is not a direct line report in the decentralised model. That's one drawback of it. So, I see that in this, sometimes there's a little oversight and a lack of shared vision and a lack of accountability that exists in that.

The model that we moved forward with at Clemson is both of those. There is a chief diversity officer and achieve diverse, excuse me, an office of equity and inclusive excellence. But then we’re moving towards building units or what you would call faculty champions. To take care of the work that really needs to be done within those particular faculties. So, here's another thing that we did as part of ours.

Professor Janelle Chiasera >> We knew that because of this, these racial tensions that existed, we know that we needed to build a commitment to diversity statement that was signed by the Board of Trustees, the senior leadership, both student groups that's out there on the website. Now, it's not on the website now. We've developed it, but we have to have those groups sign this, that say that they're committed to this as a University, as an institution of higher learning, that were committed to diversity because it enriches the educational experience for all of our students and it's steeped in the history of what a land-grant institution is really all about. It's about service to the state.

We also aligned it with university strategic planning. That is clearly articulated within that vision and mission of Clemson University. We also developed, I'm going to show you here in the next few slides, a comprehensive and actionable strategic plan that was short-term. Three years, five years at best. Sorry, I'm getting ahead here. So, the framework I will tell you was developed from information that was already collected on Clemson's campus. So, I was asked to put this framework together. It wasn't my idea. It was built on information that was collected from the past three to five years at Clemson's campus because it really needed to be a Clemson activity.

We also looked at reports from external consultants and I looked at a couple of other models from across the United States. And here's what we came up with. We needed to focus on these six areas and here they are on the slide. We needed to have diversity and inclusive excellence in our educational training. In our climate and infrastructure, so we had to figure out how we create that academic and work environment so everybody can be successful. We had to have it built into our recruitment and retention, our research and scholarship, our strategic partnerships and our leadership support and development. So, it's very comprehensive and hits all areas of the campus. And these are what we call the pillars of excellence once we get there. This is not meant for you to read but what I wanted to, and the point I always make with our faculty and staff within our institution is that we want this to be actionable. It should fit on one or two pages. It shouldn't be a 200 page document that we throw up on the shelf and never look at again. So, that is exactly what we went for. And you can see each of the purple boxes are one of our pillars that we have up there. We engaged our faculty across the campus, faculty, staff and students, to build a plan for us. So, they actually, and this is the action piece. So, for every one of those pillars that we have, they drill down into the objectives, the tactics, the timelines, the metrics, the persons responsible, the resources that are needed. And this is really what made it actionable. And this is what we think is going to keep our president in his presidency. [laughter] Because if we don't have that action, it's really going to be rough.

I'm going to quickly go through this page just to say that this is really a process for us. That involves significant communication across the campus and work group assignments. So that we can get this work down to the unit where that at work really needs to be done. Once they do the strategic plan framework, they're actually going to start implementing those tactics and timelines across the University and there's going to be biannual reporting. And that's where we can really make sure that it's accountable and be actionable. And the thing I want to leave you with is an article that just came out May 2016 which is titled The Hard Truth About Race on Campus. And it says after recent protests, universities are scrambling to expand their diversity programmes that will only heighten tensions. And I think the reason why I put this out here is because we are still not sure what we're doing here. So, I don't have a best practice for you but I did share what we're doing at Clemson University which has kind of calmed the waters a little bit. But I know that we still have a lot of work to do on our end. But that's what we have going on.

[ Applause ]

[CRISIS COMMUNICATIONS DISCUSSION begins at 01:10:05]

Dr Rosalee Rush >> I'm going to switch tones completely but the lessons learnt here can be used in any crisis situation that you're in. I'm going to speak a little faster keep us on time, so if there's anything, please stop me and ask.

Mr Luke Webster >> I was just going to say, does anybody mind if I go around and take a few photos while we're going?

Dr Rosalee Rush >> Thanks.

So, let me, in 2013, there were more than 23 acts of violence on American college universities campuses, college and university campuses. On top of that, worldwide there were more than 198 acts of national disasters at campuses across the world. And as we all know, terrorism is on the rise globally. Why is that important? That's important because our students are, are international students, we have students studying abroad. So, for us it used to be the question of if a crisis happens on your campus. It's no longer a question of if, it's when. And we have to be prepared because when you wait until a crisis hit and you're trying to create a plan, you've lost time. You've lost your credibility.

So, we define crisis as acts of violence, natural disaster, data breach, biological hazards and behaviour threats. We have all three of those on our campus so far. We've had a natural disaster which I'll talk about. This picture you see up there is our campus four years ago, five years ago underwater. And this was my first time dealing with a natural disaster on our campus. And we've also had a data breach. That is the major crisis as well. Especially when you think about we're giving our data to corporations like EAB and all that and all these people, and it's breached. So, now you have students' Social Security numbers, for the United States, all their background information, and in the United States identity theft is huge. So, that's another issue. And we've had a violent threat on our campus. So, we've had to handle several things. I wasn't there for the violent threat thankfully, but I did handle the other two. I want to set the stage. I want to show you a quick video. Set the stage. In, on September 8, 2011, tropical storm Lee unleashed a flurry of rain for states, crossing United States, at the southernmost to the East Coast. And I live in Pennsylvania so on September 9, President Obama, he announced 42 areas including Pennsylvania as natural disaster areas. And at that point, our river that rolls close to our town had crested at 32.75 feet. We were underwater. And it wasn't just our campus. Our campus actually was on a hill so we were one of the lucky ones but all the people in town, which means some of your students who live there, your faculty and your staff. Now, imagine handling and running communication and my house is underwater and you have to deal with this. Because you have to think about this type of situation.

[ Music ]

>> Normalcy is gradually making its way back onto our campus. Unfortunately, that's not the case for so many in our community. The Susquehanna River has since receded to normal levels after cresting to a record of nearly 33 feet. In it's wrath, along with this increase, remains vivid in our minds and will never be forgotten. Images of the flood of 2011 speak much louder than words, evoking strong emotions of despair, loss and frustration. Recovering from a national disaster of this magnitude will take months if not years. Meanwhile, Bloomsburg University will continue to actively meet the needs of our community and be a resource for our region. During this trying time, we have proudly served our close-knit community which helps make this institution a great place to live, learn and work.

The University has notably housed Pennsylvania National Guard troops and a rescue pet shelter on campus. Provided shuttle buses and heavy equipment to assist with clean up efforts. Worked with Bloomsburg school district to provide alternative venues for their athletic events. And countless students, faculty and staff volunteered in the town and neighbouring communities, all of whom exhibited tremendous selflessness and civic engagement and community pride.

Our students, more than 300 strong, while the University was closed for 10 days, helped flood victims by hauling appliances and waterlogged furniture from soaked homes. Clearing debris while knee-deep in mud and emptying buckets of sludge from flooded basements. Many of these volunteers were student athletes who assisted residents in between games and practices without knowing when their own next shower would come. Untold numbers of volunteer efforts have been made by faculty and staff including volunteering daily with the Red Cross and Agape, assisting thousands of flood victims.

Thank you for putting into practice our Bloomsburg University core values. You can take great pride in knowing that the extra efforts you exhibited made a difference for so many people in our community.

[ Music ]

Dr Rosalee Rush >> The reason why I showed you that, this is what happened after the flood. When the flood hit, we had over 10,000 students on campus and it was the middle the day. And our president, we had, in America, in the United States, you have to have an emergency management team, and it consists of three groups. You have you have your executive policy group which are your vice presidents, here would be your Vice Chancellors and your Provost. And they have to look at who is impacted. What you want to do. Then you have your incident command centre, which is basically who is assessing the situation, is telling us what is happening, how we want to run this. And then your operations group. How are you going to feed the students? We had no power. So, imagine trying to run communications with no power. How do I communicate with the students with social media?

And then we had to think about how we want to house, what about the students who are thinking about leaving and going home? Would do we do? And that was a critical question for us. Do we cancel classes at 2 o'clock and allow our students to get on the road and try to go home to their families when we know that the roads are underwater? So, we took a lot of flak because we did not. We told the students classes were deferred. Knowing that we were going to cancel classes. And we cancelled classes at 6 o'clock. And we purposefully did that so that they would not get on those roads. We had people stuck on the freeway trying to get to their kids in our University.

Dr Rosalee Rush >> We had our own faculty and staff stuck trying to get to their children. I was one of them. I could not leave. You have schools release the kids, saying We had to send their home. So, and we have a child daycare on our campus. So, can you imagine the chaos had we been waiting for a communication plan, had we waited to build a communication plan at that time, we would have lost all credibility. So, one of the first things that you have to have as part of your crisis communication, you have to have a plan already in place. And that plan, you have to act first, you have to communicate first and often. Because you have to be as thorough as possible and you have to be quick about it.

And the first thing we did is we sent out an email and we used social media beyond the email. We sent a tweet and said we know it's happening, basically here's what's going on weatherwise. Classes have been delayed. Stay tuned to this channel. We went out and made sure that you understood that we are the official source of communication. That is very important because what happened was we had students tweeting everyone. We had the media saying everything and people were saying what is going on? And when we went out first with that, out of the often hearsay, that established us as the first line of contact. We also turned around and said what are our most important goals of communication? In any crisis communication, you need to think about that.

Our number one goal was the safety of our students. Our second goal was the safety of our faculty and staff, because we needed them as well. The other thing was online communication people, some of them were, had gotten home and I had to communicate with them via phone or via social media. And that happened across the University. You have to figure out how you were going to communicate. So, when we pulled our team together, you have to take on different roles and you have to be flexible. You have to be willing to do that. So, what we started doing was we knew that our TVs were out. We knew that in some areas the phone lines were too jammed. Everyone was trying to call. So, when the, after the second, after the first communication, the second communication went out. Here are the ways we will contact you. We made our student media, we made our local bloggers and our local media extensions of our PR team. We went and we contacted them via phone. We called every contact we knew. We also said I will be the official spokesperson, if not me, my president. And I equipped every person on our team, even those in the executive policy leadership group with the key messages. Because you can't have five different people responding on your behalf. You have to say this is your official person and everyone needs to know what you're talking about. So, as I said, our first goal was we need to number one make sure our students are safe.

So, basically I'm rushing through this really quick. You have to, it's very important to communicate first and often and only convey the facts when they're known. It's okay to say we don't know that yet. In fact, it's better to say that. If you communicate something you don't know, then you're going back and you're trying to eat your words and you're causing confusion.

Also, monitor the news sources. We pulled out every laptop, every phone, and I think that's when I discovered the power of the portable power set, power cords. Because we needed to see what people saying about us. What were the media reports being said. Where do we need to go back and correct and tell the students that's not correct information? And the reason why that was important was because for the first time in our history, we closed our University for 10 days. We had never done. So, we had to be accurate. Because the first thing students were like well, I had an exam today. What are we going to do about this exam? I'm graduating. What's going to happen here?

Dr Rosalee Rush >> So, we had to really think this through and one of the things we did was we started communicating and we continued to communicate. We let them know that every hour or anytime there was new information, we were going to communicate with you again.

Also, I had someone on my team document every time a communication went out, every time a media enquiry came in, every action we made, every time we had an emergency meeting. And we document not only what was said but the time. You have to have that timeline because how else can we measure the effects of your communication? You have to be able to go back when this is all done. Once the crisis is contained, your communication is not over. That is really the beginning of what is to be a long-term strategy.

So, we were able to go back and look and say okay, what were the lessons learnt through this process. What you saw, we couldn't show you all the water in the video because we couldn't out and get that but we were able to get some of those images. Our students barely had water on campus but we became a resource for the whole community. I began to speak for the whole community not just for my university. Because we were there serving them. We had the National Guard on our campus. We had people, I lived with my president. Me and my family lived with my president for a week, trying to, because he had water. We had, students had, they stayed on campus because they were athletes and they might've had competition somewhere else and they couldn't go home. So, they went down knowing that they could not even take a shower and they were cleaning out houses. They were helping refurbish, it was just amazing the way we came out and the things we did. We could not have asked for that PR. That was the most positive PR we could've ever done. And we didn't do it for that. We do it because we are one university, one town. And that really solidified us as a united community.

We went down and we had even some of the faculty who are impacted, went down and started answering phones on the Red Cross. We had to log that too because we needed to know who were those faculty who were also impacted. And that was very key because you need to understand your messaging and you have to be sensitive. Every message that was put out, we had to determine, was this is for student or was this for faculty or staff who is impacted? And then on top of that, so we have the flexibility to change. We were on an agile rotation of roles. But then on top of that we had to communicate how are we going to make up the classroom instruction? And how would the students, would this impact their graduating on time? Because if you, 10 days is a lot when you think about that from a student, an instruction perspective. So, we started communicating, thinking about what do we need to do. And our, everyone was so helpful and the fact that they decided that we were not going to add on extra days. They were going to do, bring in technology and do, what was it called, blended learning. And they were going to have classes at certain times and they would allow students to watch the video, lectures if they needed to. They were also going to come in and say we won't hold Saturday classes? We decided no, this is not anyone's fault. We had to figure out how to make this happen. So, everyone started working around how do we change the scenario for our students and how do we make this the best fit everyone.

That again, we had to communicate that. How do we communicate for those who are impacted and when do they return to work? What about the student whose family was is impacted by this flood? Are we going to allow them extra time to not return to campus and how do they make up their work? Because you can't say, in one department that it's okay for you and then to another department that it's not. So we had to have those conversations as well. We also had to think about what happens in the event, did we lose any students? That was very critical because we had to account for every student. And it was easier to count when everything was going on because we had them contained.

Dr Rosalee Rush >> When they left, because naturally you finally open up campus and say you're free to go, everyone's going to leave. So, when they left campus, we had to account for who went home.

Think about that. When you guys have a huge number of students, how would you account for that? And that was one of the things. We had make phone calls. We had to say okay, when campus reopened, how did we know that everyone was on campus? Thankfully we had no fatalities. And I believe that was because we really, everyone, you cared after everyone. So, that was all part of the communications plan too. One of the things I forgot to include is the Jean Cleary Act in the United States says that in a case of emergency or any act that puts any student at immediate danger, you must communicate within 45 minutes of being notified. So, think of the pressure. You're trying to deal with, we don't know what the storm is going to do. We don't know how to advise you, and we have to communicate to you within 45 minutes.

Had we waited to figure out a time, what is our plan, we would not have been successful. We had plans, we've done, you have to have simulated exercises before time. You have to have tabletop exercises. You have to have some type of crisis but I will guarantee you, everything you learn from one of those crisis will go out the door when you're standing faced, facing a crisis. But you'll have the background and you must be calm. You must be calm in all of this.

I did that really quick because of time and I think I finished but if you have any questions, I'd be willing to answer.

[ Applause ]

Professor Sue Trinidad >> All right, thank you very much. I'm sure that we've got a few questions just before we go and enjoy our afternoon tea. I just thought it was a fascinating insight from each of your perspectives. So, thank you very much.

Professor John Phillimore >> I've got a question. I wonder if [inaudible] open day on campus and you had all the signs and make it as easy as possible for everybody who comes along to campus, that's great. And then they take them all down. And all the lessons learnt, it's not a crisis, but why not leave those signs up so everybody could actually know where they're going all the time?

Dr Rosalee Rush >> That's true [laughter].

Professor John Phillimore >> Where things like [inaudible]. Gee, why don't we just do that all the time?

Dr Rosalee Rush >> Yes.

Professor John Phillimore >> Have a communicate about students or give times to students or people on the campus rather than only in a crisis?

Dr Rosalee Rush >> Yes. One of the things we learnt, we have a 1-800 crisis line. That was one of the things. And no one ever called that. So we didn't bother to field that phone. And at that time, we found we needed to man the phone. That some people like old-fashioned communication. We also learnt that a lot of people, I didn't know that we had a shelter on campus. And all of a sudden this became very popular. So we had to, we started talking more about what's available on campus for our community and where can you go for help. So, that became part of our regular communications tool.

Professor Sue Trinidad >> Okay, well I think as we'll all be out here, I'm sure there's some questions that'll come, but please just join me in thanking the three fellows.

[ Applause ]