

The increased number of proposals for competitively based funds points to a need to increase the quality and quantity of proposals developed by student affairs staff. It also points to a greater need for student affairs units to use and cooperate with the institutional office of sponsored programs. The student affairs administrators in our study also identified a lack of training opportunities for student affairs staff in proposal development. Student affairs administrators must take a more active role in the governance issues relating to disbursement of recovered indirect costs, development of rewards systems for individuals and units who develop proposals, and expansion of institutional efforts to secure extramural funds.

References

- Davis, S. K. "Research Administration at Predominantly Undergraduate institutions with a Small Volume of Sponsored Programs." *Research Management Review*, 1988,2 (2),41-51.
- Hall, M. Gettuyig Funded: *A Complete Guide to Proposal Writing*. (3rd ed.) Portland, Oreg.: Continuing Education, Portland State University, 1988.
- Hicke, A. A., and King, K. W. "A Model for Integrating Research Administration and Graduate School Operations at a Regional Comprehensive University." *Research Management Review*, 1988,2 (1), 31-43.
- Holleman, P. "Grants Opportunities for Community College LRC's." *Community and Junior College Libraries*, 1989, 6 (2), 35-42.
- Johnston, L. D., O'Malley, P. M., and Bachman, J. G. *Illicit Drug Use, Smoking and Drinking by America's High School Students, College Students and Young Adults, 1975-1987*. Rockville, Md.: National Institute on Drug Abuse, 1988.
- Johnston, L. D., O'Malley, P. M., and Bachman, J. G. *Drug Use Among American High School Seniors, College Students, and Young Adults, 1975-1990*. Vol. 1. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1991.
- Johnston, W. "Tips on Obtaining Grants for the Community College LRC." *Community and Junior College Libraries*, 1989, 6 (2), 43-5 1.
- Meador, R. *Guidelines for Preparing Proposals*. Chelsea, Mich.: Lew-is, 1985.
- Reif-Lehrer, L. *Writing a Successful Grant Application*. (2nd ed.) Boston: Jones and Barlett, 1989. U.S. Department of Education. *What Works: Schools Without Drugs*. Publication No. 1987-178-865. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1987.

JOE L. DAVIS is chair of the Counseling Department at the University of Nebraska, Omaha.

SHARON K. DAVIS is director of the Office of Sponsored Programs at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

Sources of grant funding for cultural diversity programs are presented. The relationship between the level of external funding and institutional priorities at research universities is explored.

The Role of External Funding for Cultural Diversity Programming

Melvin C. Terrell, Donna E. Rudy, Harold E. Cheatham

Development or expansion of programs to improve the recruitment and retention of minority students has been and continues to be an important initiative for student affairs professionals. In a 1988 survey of chief student affairs officers in region 4 of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 89 percent of the respondents indicated that their institutions sponsored cultural diversity programs (Jones, Terrell, and Duggar, 1991). However, success in finding enough additional funds in the institutional budget during this current period of downsizing and cutbacks seems unlikely. External funding may yield an appropriate supplement to institutional funds or an alternative source of financial resources to adequately fund programs designed to assist minority students.

Cultural diversity can be defined in many ways. Levine (1991) presented four definitions: raising the numbers of underrepresented students and faculty, offering compensatory education and support services, encouraging participation in cocurriculum activities, and creating a tolerant campus culture.

This chapter begins with an exploration of the relationship between the role of external funding and the level of institutional commitment to cultural diversity. Then, grant sources such as government agencies and corporations that have targeted funds for cultural diversity programs in higher education are described. Next, we examine elements of successful recruitment and retention programs for minority students that are frequently cited in the literature. Finally, we report the results of a survey research study on the funding sources of cultural diversity programs at U.S. research universities.

Institutional Commitment and the Level of Grant Support

To determine the appropriate level of grant support, it is important to discern if the top leadership views minority student programming as a high priority. If so, they probably have taken the following steps: inclusion of cultural diversity in the institutional mission statement; establishment of hiring goals for a diverse faculty and administration; coordination of training programs for faculty, staff, and students; and maintenance of a system of rewards and punishments for behavior relating to a hospitable campus climate (Stewart, 1991). This kind of support constitutes what Cheatham (1989) termed "institutional signature."

If cultural diversity programming appears to be a high institutional priority, student affairs professionals may employ the strategy of pursuing supplementary grant funds as opposed to funds to support the cost of the entire program. In this way, the leadership can demonstrate their support for the program by making a budgetary commitment in a tight money environment. At the same time, a percentage of the program expenses will be paid by an external source.

If cultural diversity programming does not appear to be a high institutional priority, an appropriate strategy may be to attempt to support the entire program with grant funds. In this way, the top leadership will be less inclined to veto the project, knowing that there is no expectation of institutional funding. Eventually, if the program is successful, cultural diversity programming may become a higher priority to the institution.

Sources of Funding for Cultural Diversity Programming

The most helpful reference for locating grant sources is the *Minority Funding Report*, a monthly summary of federal and corporate financial opportunities for disadvantaged and minority groups. Each issue contains descriptions of grants, relevant federal policies, legislative outlook for bills targeting minorities, and federal commission rules about the process of awarding grants.

The federal government has been active in funding programs for minority students in higher education. Federal grants have supported the Trio programs, which have been providing services to low-income students, particularly minority students, since 1967. More than 40 percent of Trio participants are African American, 35 percent are white, 17 percent are Hispanic, 4 percent are American Indian, and 3 percent are Asian American. More than a quarter of a \$197 million increase in the federal budget for higher education was allocated to Trio programs in fiscal year (FY) 1992 (*Trio Programs Prosper*. . . , 1991).

Trio consists of the following programs targeted to low-income and academically or physically handicapped students: Upward Bound, Talent Search, Educational Opportunity Centers, Student Support Services, Ronald

E. McNair Post-Baccalaureate Achievement Program, and Staff Training and Program Evaluation. Both Upward Bound and Talent Search reach out to students in high school. Upward Bound provides instruction in English, mathematics, and science on college campuses after school, Saturdays, and during the summer. Talent Search attempts to reduce dropout rates by helping students complete admission and financial aid applications for college. Educational Opportunity Centers provide low-income adults with information about postsecondary education opportunities. The goal of Student Support Services is to increase college graduation rates by providing tutoring, counseling, and remedial instruction. The purpose of the Ronald E. McNair Post-Baccalaureate Achievement Program, named for an astronaut killed in the 1986 space shuttle explosion, is to encourage low-income and minority undergraduates to consider careers in college teaching and to prepare them for doctoral study.

Another federal grant source, the National Science Foundation (NSF), made a commitment to strengthening the quantity and quality of minority science students by contributing \$15 million in grants in FY 1992 (*Minority Funding Report* ... 1992). At the precollege level, the NSF is encouraging school districts with significant minority enrollments to establish partnerships with colleges and universities. There are summer science camps for junior high school students, school district projects to improve instruction, and regional centers based on a broad coalition of groups that includes school districts, colleges, businesses, state and local governments, and community organizations.

At the college level, the NSF goal is to involve undergraduate and graduate students in research. Components of the effort include early faculty mentoring, special academic counseling, and participation in research.

Some U.S. corporations have funded scholarships and fellowships for specific minority groups for particular purposes such as the following: General Motors for scholarships to Hispanic engineering students, Sears for Hispanic students, Gannet Foundation for scholarships to Hispanic journalists, IBM for minority engineering students at Tennessee State University, and General Electric with fellowships for minority professors (*Minority Funding Report* ... 1992).

Relatively few foundations and corporations have attempted to address the issue of campus climate. Philip Morris Companies, Ford Foundation, and the Lilly Endowment have committed more than \$9 million over several years to make campus climates more tolerant (McMillen, 1992). Ford and Philip Morris have invited colleges nationwide to compete, but Lilly has restricted its awards to private colleges in eight states. Ford and Lilly look for curriculum reform and faculty development, while Philip Morris is geared toward extracurricular activities and faculty recruitment.

State governments are also concerned about assisting minority students in higher education. For example, in Illinois, the Higher Education Coopera-

tion Act was designed to recruit and retain minority students in higher education and to facilitate the transfer of minority students from two-year to four-year institutions. For FY 1991, \$3.6 million was appropriated for recruitment and retention programs and \$1.25 million was appropriated for articulation grants (State of Illinois Board of Higher Education, 1990).

Elements of Successful Recruitment and Retention Programs

There is considerable literature that describes the elements of successful cultural diversity programs. Student affairs professionals should consider including some or all of the following elements in their program designs.

Recruitment Program. A well-defined recruitment program with special admission criteria designed specifically to attract minority students is a prerequisite to achieving access (Green, 1990).

Services. Services that have proved essential for retention of minority students are financial aid, career and personal counseling, academic advising, investigation of racial incidents, basic academic skills development, cooperative education, child care and transportation services, and early intervention by the student's adviser to resolve problems (Edmunds and McCurdy, 1988; Trippi and Cheatham, 1991).

Special Programs. A series of activities and events can be structured to meet the needs of minority students who experience social isolation in predominately white universities. Through these programs, minority students learn that they do not have to sacrifice their own cultural identities to become part of the general student culture (Nettles and Johnson, 1987).

Support Programs. Armstrong-West and de la Teja (1988) delineated the following support programs as particularly helpful in retaining minority students: summer "bridge," parents program, freshman orientation, mentoring, and leadership and organizational development.

Campus Climate. The academic environments should be conducive to learning for all students and should reflect, without prejudice, the reality of a pluralistic society. However, campus climates have been infected by "the proliferation of racism and the growing perception of hostility and incivility" (Henley, Powell, and Poats, 1992, p. 14).

A number of exemplary programs have been developed and implemented to counteract negative attitudes toward minority students. Gordon and Strode (1992) conducted structured telephone interviews of seven institutions that initiated programs to enhance their campus climates. States such as California, New York, and Pennsylvania have passed legislation requiring their public institutions to enact programs to address campus climate (Nayman, Resnick, and Dye, 1992).

In short, the role of external funding for cultural diversity programming seems to depend on the institutional commitment to cultural diversity

programming, the availability of external sources of funding for cultural diversity programming, and the design of proposed programs. To discover the actual role of external funding for cultural diversity programming at research universities, we conducted survey research on the topic.

Survey on Funding of Cultural Diversity Programs

One purpose of the study was to collect data about the kinds of minority student programs that are offered currently at research institutions. The second goal was to discover what funding sources support existing minority student programs at research institutions, and to determine, especially, the breakdown between institutional and external funds. The third goal was to find out if minority student programming is among the top institutional priorities in research institutions. The last goal was to discern what relationship, if any, exists between the level of external funding and institutional priorities.

It was expected that research institutions would have cultural diversity programs in place and that they would be considered, in each case, an institutional priority. According to a national survey of college and university presidents conducted by the American Council on Education, presidents at research and doctoral institutions (32 percent) were more likely than their counterparts at comprehensive (21 percent), liberal arts (14 percent), and two-year colleges (5 percent) to identify interracial and intercultural relations as an area of great concern (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1991, p. 23).

The literature did not provide any guidance in forming expectations about the use of external funding and its relationship to institutional priorities and cultural diversity programming. However, if there was strong institutional support for cultural diversity programs, we hypothesized that they would be supported with internal funding alone or with internal funding supplemented by external funding. If there was minimal institutional support for cultural diversity programs, we expected the programs to be supported entirely with external funding or with external funding supplemented by internal funding.

Method. A survey titled "Funding Minority Programming" was designed to collect data about the kinds of minority student programs offered at research institutions, the funding sources for the programs, and institutional perspectives toward externally funded programs. The survey was mailed in March 1992 to chief student affairs officers at all sixty-eight Carnegie category I research universities. Two weeks later, a follow-up survey was mailed. Overall, 66 percent (N = 45) of the recipients responded.

Approximately 70 percent of the sample worked in urban universities. Of the remaining 30 percent, approximately 18 percent worked at suburban and 12 percent at rural institutions. The average student enrollment was

23,465, and the average minority student enrollment was 4,657, or approximately 20 percent of the total student enrollment. This percentage is comparable to the 18.7 percent minority student enrollment in all institutions of higher education in 1991-1992 ("Many Colleges Report Increases. . . , " 1992). The average number of staff was 127, and the average number of minority staff was 35. Minority persons comprised approximately 28 percent of the professional staff in student affairs.

Results. Almost all of the institutions reported having a large number of student-affairs-oriented programs for minority students. Most (97.8 percent) reported special cultural events, targeted recruitment, minority scholarships, and orientation with a focus on cultural diversity; 95.6 percent sponsored summer bridge programs; 91 percent presented cross-cultural communication programming and financial assistance for minority graduate students; 88.9 percent provided leadership development training.

Faculty were involved extensively in student affairs programming for minority students: 53.3 percent of the respondents indicated that their faculties wrote joint grant proposals '66 percent reported that their faculties coordinated special events, 73.3 percent reported that their faculties presented special conferences and workshops, and about 80 percent viewed their faculties as mentors to minority students. However, only 7 percent of the universities participating in this study required cultural diversity courses. This fact raises questions about faculty involvement in curriculum reform, which may be an appropriate topic for a future study.

The institutions varied in their commitment to programming for specific minority student populations: 93.4 percent reported that they offered programs targeted to African Americans, 80 percent for Hispanics, and 62.3 percent for Asian and Native American students. These findings may indicate institutional sensitivity to the programming needs of ethnic minority students in predominantly white institutions.

The results suggest that there is a high institutional commitment to minority student programming at U.S. research universities. Indeed, 68.9 percent of the respondents indicated that the provision of programs for minority students was included in their institutional mission statements, and 91.1 percent reported that cultural diversity was emphasized in orientation sessions for new students.

In terms of the role that external funding played in supporting cultural diversity programming, one-half of those responding indicated that 25 percent of the funding for minority student programming was supplied from external sources and believed it *should be* supplied by external funding sources. The other half indicated that all funding was and *should be* supplied by institutional funds.

The data suggest a positive relationship between high institutional commitment to minority programming and reliance on internal funding. The

following percentages of institutions used internal funds only to pay program costs: summer bridge programs (69 percent), special cultural events (78 percent), orientation with a focus on cultural diversity (84 percent), targeted recruitment (87 percent), leadership development training (93 percent), and cross-cultural communication (96 percent). In addition, the following percentages of institutions supported programs for specific minority groups by internal funds alone: African American (67 percent), Hispanic (71 percent), Native American (80 percent), and Asian American (82 percent).

Also, there seems to be a positive relationship between high institutional commitment to minority programming and the use of external funds to supplement minority undergraduate scholarships: 51 percent of the respondents indicated that their institutions received external funding to supplement minority scholarships. The results do not indicate what other kinds of cultural diversity programs have been widely supplemented by external funds.

The results also suggest that most of the respondents believed that a larger role for external funding of minority student programming is appropriate. Approximately 66 percent agreed or strongly agreed that use of external funds for minority programming represented a responsible strategy to counteract budgetary constraints, and 95.6 percent believed that external organizations have a valid stake in promoting the academic success of minority students.

A clear-cut minority of respondents believed that external funding can be used more extensively. Somewhat less than one half (42.2 percent) of the respondents believed that externally funded programs were as important as internally funded programs. Further, this group, in comparison to those who responded that internally funded programs were more important, demonstrated a greater tendency to endorse the notion that external funds should play a greater role than only supporting nonpermanent programs. This group also was more likely to have had experience with state-funded programs at their institutions. In short, this group with experience in state-funded programs believed that the role of external funding should be expanded regardless of the level of institutional commitment to cultural diversity programming.

As hypothesized, cultural diversity programs were in place at most of the institutions, and cultural diversity was considered an institutional priority according to most of the respondents. With these conditions, one would expect the programs to be funded exclusively with internal funding or to be funded primarily with internal funding supplemented by external funding. The results indicate that these expectations were correct. One-half of the institutions funded their cultural diversity programs with internal funding only, and the other half funded their programs with internal funds supplemented by external funds.

Conclusion

There is an optimistic outlook for student affairs professionals who are interested in pursuing grant funding to provide support for cultural diversity programming. According to the existing literature and the results of the study of research universities reported in this chapter, cultural diversity is considered a high priority in most institutions. In addition, most institutions have developed an array of programs to address cultural diversity concerns. Moreover, funding is available from federal and state agencies and from corporate and private foundations to promote cultural diversity.

However, there is a tendency to use institutional funds to provide sole funding for cultural diversity programs. When an institution makes a major budgetary commitment to a program, it is clear that it values the program. For this reason, the majority of the respondents in our study believed that internally funded programs are more important than externally funded programs. Any consideration of other sources of funding may bring into question the level of institutional commitment to cultural diversity. In fact, one-half of the institutions in our study of research universities funded their cultural diversity programs entirely with institutional funds and believed that the programs should be funded only with internal funds.

Even though this preference for internal funding exists, we believe that institutions that value cultural diversity should consider pursuing supplementary funding to provide financial relief to beleaguered institutional budgets. Most of the chief student affairs officers in the study believed that use of external funds for minority programming represents a responsible strategy to counteract budgetary constraints. Also, almost all believed that external organizations have a valid stake in promoting the academic success of minority students.

The use of external funding as a supplement to internal funding does not constitute a reduced institutional commitment to cultural diversity. The institutions in our study still made the major contribution and commitment when only 25 percent of the program funding was supplied by an external source. In fact, one-half of the institutions in the study used approximately 75 percent internal and 25 percent external funds to support their cultural diversity programs.

Our analysis of the programs frequently funded by external sources, revealed primarily scholarships and fellowships for individual undergraduate and graduate minority students. Programs such as summer bridge programs, special cultural events, focused orientation, targeted recruitment, leadership development training, and cross-cultural communication were not supplemented as often with external funding.

Student affairs professionals may want to consider areas generally supported by internal funds as well as campus climate in determining what

kinds of proposals to develop. There is considerable literature that delineates the elements that lead to success in these types of programs.

Now is an appropriate time to pursue external funding for cultural diversity programming. With the goal of cultural diversity receiving wide-spread acceptance and the availability of a number of funding possibilities coinciding with tight institutional budgets, there is a genuine opportunity to use external sources to supplement cultural diversity programs funded primarily through institutional budgets.

References

- Armstrong-West, S., and de la Teja, M. "Social and Psychological Factors Affecting the Retention of Minority Students." In M. C. Terrell and D. J. Wright (eds.), *From Survival to Success: Promoting Minority Student Retention*. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1988.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. 'Perspectives on Campus Life.' *Change*, Sept.-Oct. 1991, pp. 21-24.
- Cheatham, H. E. 'Reversing the Decline of African American Enrollment in U.S. Higher Education.' *Southeastern Association of Educational Opportunity Program Personnel Journal*, 1989, 8, 14-22.
- Edmunds, M. M., and McGurdy, D. P. 'Academic Integration: Tools for Minority Retention.' In M. C. Terrell and D. J. Wright (eds.), *From Survival to Success: Promoting Minority Student Retention*. Washington, D. C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1988.
- Gordon, S. E., and Strode, C. B. 'Enhancing Cultural Diversity and Building a Climate of Understanding: Becoming an Effective Change Agent.' In M. C. Terrell (ed.), *Diversity, Disunity, and Campus Community*. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1992.
- Green, M. (ed.). *Minorities on Campus: A Handbook for Enhancing Diversity*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1990.
- Henley, B., Powell, T., and Poats, L. 'Achieving Cultural Diversity: Meeting the Challenges.' in M. C. Terrell (ed.), *Diversity, Disunity, and Campus Community*. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1992.
- Jones, A. C., Terrell, M. C., and Duggar, M. 'The Role of Student Affairs in Fostering Cultural Diversity in Higher Education.' *NASPA Journal*, 1991, 28 (2), 121-128.
- Levine, A. "The Meaning of Diversity." *Change*, Sept-Oct. 1991, pp. 4-5.
- McMillen, L. "Three Grant Makers Are Awarding Millions in Effort to Improve Racial Tolerance on College Campuses." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Feb. 26, 1992, pp. A1, A33. "Many Colleges Report Increases in Applications for Next Fall." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Mar. 18, 1992, p. A35.
- Minority Funding Report: A Monthly Report on Federal, Private, and *Nonprofit Financial Aid Opportunities for Disadvantaged and Minority Groups*. East Providence, R.I.: Newsletter Press of New England, 1992.
- Nayman, R. L., Resnick, J. C., and Dye, R. E. "Promoting Diversity and Equity Within the California State University: System-Level Mandates, Strategies, and Issues." In M. C. Terrell (ed.), *Diversity, Disunity, and Campus Community*. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1992.
- Nettles, M., and Johnson, J. 'Race, Sex, and Other Determinants of College Student Socialization.' *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1987, 28, 512-524.
- State of Illinois Board of Higher Education. *Higher Education Cooperation Act Fiscal Year 1991 Grant Allocations*. Springfield: State of Illinois, 1990.

Stewart, J. "Planning for Cultural Diversity: A Case Study." In H. E. Cheatham and Associates (eds.), *Cultural Pluralism on Campus*. Alexandria, Va.: American College Personnel Association Media Board, 1991.

"Trio Programs Prosper as Congress Focuses on Need for Colleges to Recruit More Low-Income Students." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 3, 1991, p. A17.

Trippi, J., and Cheatham, H. E. "Counseling Effects on African American College Student Graduation." *Journal of Counseling and Student Development*, 1991, 32, 342-349.

MELVIN C. TERRELL is vice president for student affairs and professor of counselor education at Northeastern Illinois University, Chicago.

DONNA E. RUDY is assistant to the vice president for student affairs at Northeastern Illinois University.

HAROLD E. CHEATHAM is head of the Department of Counselor Education, Counseling Psychology, and Rehabilitation Services Education at The Pennsylvania State University, University Park.

Collaboration between student affairs and institutional advancement professionals can greatly enhance efforts to involve current students in institutional advancement activities and thereby produce future donors.

Turning Students Into Alumni Donors

Robbie L. Nayman, Harry R. Gianneschi, Judy M. Mandel

Previous chapters in this volume confirm the limited role that student affairs staff have had in institutional advancement activities in postsecondary education, and they acknowledge the substantive contribution's student affairs involvement can make to institutional advancement efforts. In this chapter, we present the results of a recent national survey that examined both the type and depth of collaboration that currently exists between student affairs and institutional advancement offices. Specifically, the survey examined efforts to involve students in institutional advancement programs and increase student understanding and awareness of their future responsibilities as alumni donors.

Collaboration Between Student Affairs and Institutional Advancement: An Emerging Partnership

Historically, at most American colleges and universities collaboration between student affairs and university advancement staff on institutional advancement goals has been a rarity or, most often, nonexistent. In the past, mutual lack of knowledge of mission, goals, and scope of services encouraged a sense of territoriality; and the absence of occasions to interact as colleagues hampered the development of mutually beneficial working relationships between student affairs and institutional advancement staff.

As educational fundraising and institutional advancement have grown in importance as viable strategies to mitigate diminishing fiscal resources and downsizing within the higher education community, there has been increasing awareness among institutional advancement professionals of the necessity for total institutional commitment to the institutional advancement