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I. INTRODUCTION

On October 30 through November 1, 2002, a team of six persons, each widely experienced in higher education and none having any present or past association with Grambling State University, reviewed the general condition of the University (Appendix A). The Review included assessing materials and conducting interviews from October 1, 2002 through December 20, 2002. This report was intentionally delayed in order to incorporate the recommendations of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools regarding Grambling State University’s reaffirmation of accreditation.

The purpose of the Review was to assess the general condition of the University from an objective yet informed perspective. The team was charged to candidly identify and address issues affecting Grambling and help establish a tentative agenda for the immediate future.

In addition, the Review might offer these benefits:

1. All concerned parties would have a more accurate impression of Grambling and consider more specific and realistic plans and expectations.
2. Faculty, administrators, students, alumni, elected and appointed officials, the media, and the general public would consider the report to be a legitimate and less biased opinion of Grambling that might differ from their own.
3. The region, the state and beyond would have a heightened awareness of, and interest in, Grambling because of the involvement in the Review and a public report on the results.

The Review considered the following in terms of strengths, limitations, and/or aspirations:

- General condition of Grambling
- Academic programs
- Faculty
- Students
- Administration
- Technology
- Budget and finance
- Intercollegiate athletics
- Fund-raising
- Public relations (including alumni and legislative relations)
- Governance
- Other issues and conditions presented during the course of this Review.

Before beginning interviews, team members read and evaluated materials assembled by Grambling staff. All counted, interview and focus groups included 261 persons including faculty, students, staff, alumni, elected/appointed officials, area residents, local business persons, members of the Board and its System staff, media representatives, benefactors, and potential benefactors, persons selected because of special knowledge, and randomly selected persons from the community (Appendix B). Interviewees were based on position, stratified random sampling, and random sampling. All interviews followed a general format that included 16 separate areas (Appendix C).
Interviewers were to ask about, but not press, each of the areas and all interviewed were advised that their opinions might be used in the final report but without attribution.

Readers should bear in mind that although much of the Review can be documented, it is largely based on the opinions of those persons interviewed. Wherever the opinions of the Review team are expressed, it shall be obvious.

Although each interviewer contributed directly to this review, the final product is the exclusive work of James L. Fisher, Ltd and should not be attributed to individual members of the Review team.
II. OVERVIEW

Grambling State University means many things to many different people. Because the University has achieved national visibility and has become an internationally recognized brand name, far more individuals are aware of Grambling than is true for most of its state and regional public university competitors. Hence, when the word “Grambling” is read or heard, it evokes strong recognition and a variety of images among millions of individuals throughout the United States and the world.

To some, Grambling means the institution that has provided thousands of students with a passport to educational opportunity and social and economic progress. As a current Grambling student aptly put it, “Grambling gave me and lots of other people a chance. It extends a helping hand that hardly anyone else would give us.” One cannot but be impressed with the tremendous “value added” benefit Grambling generates when it has, as many of the other Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), admitted a number of young people with less than standard collegiate preparation and then transformed them into educated, competitive, college graduates. Grambling excels in this arena and what one staff person called “the Grambling legacy” spans many generations of grateful and well-educated students.

Without question, the vision of the intrepid individuals who founded the Colored Industrial and Agricultural School in 1901 has been realized and expanded upon many times over. Determined, skillful presidents such as Dr. R.W.E. Jones (who led the University for more than four decades during the mid-20th century) built the institution and its traditions despite the burdens of segregation and woeful funding. Nonetheless, there is daily evidence of the institution’s productivity in the form of the achievements and successes of Grambling alumni. Many of these individuals occupy significant positions of responsibility and their loyalty to Grambling is unparalleled. Some of those individuals include: U.S Magistrate Calvin Botley; Harvard Medical School Professor, Dr. Byron Ford; Vice President of Cisco Systems, Ms. Dixie Garr; Lincoln University President Ivory Nelson; and Walter Rhodes, Vice President of the Baton Rouge based Shaw Group, a Fortune 500 Company. The list of prominent alumni is lengthy and the message is clear that Grambling has indeed contributed greatly to the development of highly successful individuals and thus has contributed greatly to the economic development of Louisiana and to America.

Grambling’s motto is “The Place Where Everybody Is Somebody,” and the institution attempts to live that dream on a daily basis. Students report that “faculty pay close attention to us” and “they make themselves available to help us whenever we need help.” This contributes to what a senior (who transferred from another institution) eloquently described as “an atmosphere of belonging and respect.”

To many others, locally and nationally, Grambling is synonymous with outstanding athletic teams, particularly in the realm of football. The legendary and highly successful Eddie Robinson plied his trade at Grambling for more than five decades and won more than 400 games. Grambling has contributed athletes to the
National Football League (six currently) and its highly successful head football coach, Doug Williams, was the first African American quarterback of a Super Bowl winner and is well known to all professional football fans. He has renewed the Tigers’ tradition of dominance in HBCU football, where Grambling often has been ranked number one in the country.

Hall of Fame professional athletes such as Tank Younger, Buck Buchanan, Willie Davis, Ernie Ladd and Willis Reed ensured over the years that Grambling’s name would spread nationwide and this has resulted in Grambling’s teams attracting a nationwide following. Almost in the tradition of Notre Dame’s “subway alumni,” Grambling’s teams attract big crowds (sometimes approaching 80,000) in locations throughout the country. This is one of the major reasons why Grambling is so viable as a brand name and of course has helped the institution recruit and attract students. More than 40 percent of the students in the Fall 2002 freshmen class came from outside of Louisiana and it seems likely one of several reasons for this is the high visibility of Grambling’s athletic teams. Hence, one is not surprised to find individuals wearing attire with the Grambling logo in locations thousands of miles distant from Louisiana. A Grambling alumnus in Virginia commented to a member of this team, “When I pick up the sports page every morning, the first thing I look to see is how the Tigers did last night.”

To still others, Grambling has always conjured the image of the Marching Tiger Band, a captivating and nationally recognized group that became the first college marching band to be inducted into the NCAA’s Hall of Champions. The Band has performed at Super Bowls, NFL and NBA games, and internationally. It is a justifiable source of pride for the campus and has inspired many imitators.

To the vast majority of today’s Grambling students, the University represents, as one student put it simply, “a good place to get my education.” The most recent ACT Student Opinion Survey reveals that Grambling students are typically satisfied with their educational experience and believe especially that the GSU faculty members are capable and concerned.

Those who know Grambling well are aware that nearly all of its professional programs that are eligible for disciplinary accreditation have achieved that status, including business, education, nursing, and social work. These are no minor achievements for any institution and speak well for the energy and discipline of several generations of faculty and administrators. “We have a devoted, talented group of faculty and staff here,” observed one veteran faculty member, while a state educational official commented that “Despite Grambling’s difficulties, we shouldn’t lose sight that the institution really has met quite a few demanding academic standards.”

Despite Grambling’s many points of pride, it is impossible to avoid taking notice of what a higher education official labeled “Grambling’s difficulties.” For approximately the last decade, Grambling has experienced a set of problems—primarily financial reporting and accounting—that generated a spate of negative publicity and ultimately resulted in the sanction of warning from the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and
Schools (COC/SACS) which evolved into the institution being placed on probation. The institution has had to deal with a steady drumbeat of critical media coverage that has to some degree impacted the University’s successes and triumphs. The adverse media coverage has highlighted the institution’s difficulties in maintaining conventional accounting and budgetary standards; decrease in student enrollment; administrative instability; questionable competence of previous GSU administrators; deterioration of some of its buildings (especially its dorms); and unkempt grounds. Even previous Boards of Supervisors have been pummeled for allegedly yielding to pressures from the Governor’s office in appointing presidents, and from local and state political figures for “recommending” certain personnel to be hired by GSU.

While some may dispute the intensity and focus of the critical media coverage of Grambling’s travails, there is no real dispute over most of the salient facts. The institution went four years without receiving an unqualified audit report. The condition of several of the institution’s antiquated residence halls have deteriorated further; so much that Grambling now intends to tear some of them down and start over by means of a partnership with private entrepreneurs. The University’s enrollment fell from a high of about 7,500 headcount in 1995 to about 4,500 today. Nor is there disagreement about the lack of maintenance of a number of the institution’s buildings and its grounds.

Fortunately, there also exists a consensus at the Board of Supervisors and on campus that things need (and have begun) to change at Grambling, especially in terms of how it conducts its financial affairs. As one member of the Board of Supervisors put it, “We will do anything necessary to solve the problems that exist at Grambling.”

And changes have been made at GSU. The Board appointed Dr. Sally Clausen on July 1, 2001 and Dr. Warner (acting GSU President) with the Board and System President Clausen’s approval hired Chief Financial Officer Billy Owens. Mr. Owens and Dr. Clausen were each charged with analyzing Grambling’s operations and taking the necessary steps to achieve an unqualified audit. Among the immediate steps were:

- Determining the skill level of existing staff;
- Issuing termination notices to over 100 staff;
- Obtaining Approval of Civil Service Commission for lay-off action
- Hiring over 25 new staff;
- Providing an action plan with specific timelines and individuals responsible for each action;
- Meeting with Board members, legislators, alumni, and other stakeholders to inform and solicit support for actions taken;
- Training existing and new staff in correct procedures to use Banner systems; and
- Providing professional development for staff to implement Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) 34 and 35.

The results 13 months later were, according to Legislative Auditor Dr. Dan Kyle, “phenomenal”.
Grambling received an unqualified audit for the year 2002. Many herald this as the beginning of a Grambling renaissance that would elicit the support of students, public and private supporters. This success sparked other positive action across the campus. Grambling, with the encouragement of System President and Board staff, initiated plans to tear down archaic dorms and build new modern apartment-style facilities through a private-public non-profit corporation. Enrollment jumped up by 18 percent (1,800 new freshmen) for the 2002-03 entering class. Also, GSU is taking recent pride in the fact that 100% of the teacher candidates who sat for Praxis (the national teachers’ exam) in 2001-2002 passed all parts prior to program completion. Finally and perhaps most significantly, in December 2002, while the Commission on Colleges (COC) did not lift GSU’s probation, the Executive Director of COC/SACS stated that “Grambling had made significant recent progress” and that COC/SACS “wanted to see that progress sustained”. Hence, there is remarkable optimism on campus. “We’ve turned the corner!” said an administrator, almost with a sense of exultation. A senior administrator proudly and repeatedly referred to “The New Grambling,” an institution he believes is in the process of surmounting its problems and creating an exciting new future.

Yet, amidst this enthusiasm and focus on financial matters, there has been a tendency for the campus and its constituents to overlook the reality that Grambling is not without other issues. The University, the Board of Supervisors, and the institution’s President must deal with an imposing set of issues and challenges in the near future. Among the fundamental concerns confronting the institution are:

- Matters relating to the institution’s future admissions standards after the desegregation Settlement Agreement in 2005, including strategies to increase its enrollment of non-African-Americans students,
- Grambling’s relationship to the burgeoning state community college system,
- Structure and composition of senior administrative leadership,
- The need to develop and implement the institution’s physical plant, while addressing deferred maintenance needs that approximate $50 million,
- The use of its scarce faculty resources to teach courses with extremely small enrollments,
- The allocation of and dependence on Title III funds that the University receives from the U.S. Government,
- The composition of the University’s general education program requirements,
- The need to provide ongoing professional development for all faculty and staff,
Financing and controlling intercollegiate athletic programs,

• The perception among a large segment of students that a number of its staff members are uncaring,

• The inordinate amount of time that students invest when they deal with registration, advisement, financial aid and other student services,

• The destructive behavior of a few students in University residence halls, and the flouting of the law by some individuals, primarily non-students on campus,

• The need to restructure and revitalize the University’s largely unproductive fund raising efforts,

• The need to re-examine Grambling’s alumni organization and activities, and

• The appointment of a permanent, dynamic and highly productive University President.
III. ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

Academic life at Grambling State University is organized into six academic colleges (Business, Education, Science and Technology, Basic and Special Studies, Honors, and Liberal Arts), three schools (Nursing, Social Work and Graduate Studies) and the Division of Continuing Education. The University offers approximately 50 distinct baccalaureate curricula, a dozen master’s degrees, and three doctoral programs. In addition, Grambling offers associate degrees in areas such as child development and criminal justice.

Those familiar with Grambling are particularly laudatory of its programs in nursing, computer science and teacher education. In the areas of teacher education, the University has long operated K-12 laboratory schools on campus, an increasing rarity among institutions of higher education today, but an activity that presents many opportunities for laboratory and legitimate research activity. In addition, criminal justice is often cited as an outstanding program because of the excellent internship activities it offers its students. Interviewees were less complimentary about several disciplines within the social sciences and humanities that were viewed as weak because of mediocre faculty who were described as neither great teachers nor publishing scholars.

A recurrent theme at Grambling is built around the notion that “our academic health varies considerably from department to department” (virtually identical comments by a department chair and an academic dean). Faculty, in particular, cite examples of departments that are well off and those that are languishing. The availability of federal funds, participation in desegregation Settlement Agreement funding and the academic preferences of administrators all were mentioned as reasons. From our vantage point, the disparity between departments was especially noticeable where academic equipment is concerned. Some departments or areas appear to have most of what they need; others have considerably less.

Another recurrent theme at Grambling is the notion that “the University is attempting to do too much.” Those who voice this opinion (and they include individuals on- and off-campus) believe that the University has been reluctant to prune its academic offerings. “We need more actions similar to what we did with the MBA,” said a faculty veteran. (Grambling put its MBA degree “into cold storage” about two years ago, at least partially because of AACSB accreditation requirements.) (1) We believe the University President should immediately begin an intensive review of Grambling’s academic offerings, with a view toward eliminating some programs and adding others that more appropriately meet student and state needs.

(2) We also recommend that the University President initiate an examination of the University’s academic organizational structure. Few academic institutions with a predominantly undergraduate enrollment maintain nine independent colleges and schools, plus a separate continuing education unit. We believe the University would benefit from some consolidation, not only because funds would be saved, but also because merger would stimulate more interdisciplinary conversations. One example for consideration would be to merge the College of Liberal Arts with the College of Science and Technology, to create a College of Arts
and Sciences. However, the examination of academic organization should not stop with the colleges and
schools. We also recommend a study of the structure of academic departments for more possible
consolidations. This is consistent with one administrators’ belief that “We have some very small departments
and programs and it’s probably time to do the sensible thing and merge several administratively.”

(3) There exists a variety of academic issues that would benefit from timely and intense reviews. We
believe these reviews should be undertaken individually, but then folded into an overall institutional strategic
plan that deals with all areas of the University. We recommend that the University engage in an institution-
wide set of conversations designed to update the existing strategic plan, incorporate new presidential thrusts
and provide for rigorous evaluation of programs and services, with a view toward terminating some of them.
To be functional, such a plan must include timelines, officers whom will be held accountable, and sources of
funding.

General Education

Grambling’s 42-semester hour general education program, which must be completed by all candidates for
baccalaureate degrees, is adequate, but could be strengthened. The University should be complimented for its
emphasis placed on effective writing; the three-course requirement is admirable. We also commend the institution
for having established a computer literacy requirement, as computer literacy is absolutely vital to intelligent
citizenship and lifelong learning in the 21st century.

While the student body of Grambling is not racially or ethnically diverse compared to institutions
nationally, upon graduation, they will enter a world that is multiethnic, multiracial, and increasingly international.
We believe it essential that the University guarantee that each graduate come to grips with issues relating to this
exciting and challenging new world. Therefore, (4) we recommend that every Grambling graduate complete at
least one course relating to a non-Western or non-English speaking culture as a general education
requirement. Further, we believe every Grambling graduate should complete at least one year of study of a
foreign language and/or travel abroad.

Language is the repository and bearer of a culture. It is not possible to understand the intricacies of another
culture without coming to grips with its language and, perforce, how it approaches, thinks about, and formulates
issues. Consider that Spanish already is the second language of the United States and in fact is the first language in
many geographic areas. Grambling graduates who hope to cooperate and compete in the United States in the 21st
century would be well advised to acquire Spanish language competence. It is the duty of the University, via its
general education program, to push its students in that direction and arm them for the world in which they will live.
Faculty Research and Scholarly Productivity

Grambling is a teaching institution that offers more than a dozen graduate programs. The University always has emphasized the importance of highly effective teaching performed by talented, concerned and committed faculty who also act as mentors for their students. In the past, the nature of Grambling’s portfolio of academic programs and the paucity of its state funding may have resulted in a lack of faculty emphasis on research and scholarly productivity. It is apparent in reports filed by the University for COC/SACS, disciplinary accrediting bodies and the Board of Supervisors that refereed scholarship, juried performances and shows, and grant activity have not been high priorities at Grambling.

We believe this situation should change. (5) Given the nature of Grambling’s emerging graduate commitments, its need to retain or attain disciplinary accreditations and the constant expansion of knowledge, it is essential that Grambling faculty establish meaningful scholarly research programs. This is especially true in those disciplines that support graduate degrees, where it is unlikely that faculty will maintain currency in their disciplines if they are not conversant with, and contributing to, the body of knowledge in their areas of expertise. Such expectations should be clearly included in an annual faculty evaluation process.

This will require some reorientation on the part of some Grambling faculty, particularly those in departments offering graduate degrees. Our conversations with faculty (and their graduate students) revealed little appreciation for scholarly research and grant activity among some Grambling faculty. Academic administrators must lead a process of change by the standards they set for faculty research and scholarship, the decisions they make, the resources they allocate, and their own rhetoric. We do not advocate a “one size fits all” faculty model whereby all faculty must become research scholars. We do believe, however, that the maturation of Grambling State University now requires a much greater emphasis upon faculty research and scholarship and grant activity than the institution has seen heretofore. In particular, newly employed faculty should understand that there are, and will be, meaningful scholarly expectations for them when promotion, tenure and salary decisions are made.

(6) Accompanying this change in expectations, however, must be an increased institutional allocation of resources to support research, scholarship, and grant activity. We recommend that Grambling employ an experienced, full-time Director of Research who will focus upon grant activity and funded research. This individual should report to the Graduate Dean and be willing to work closely with faculty in developing and implementing their research/scholarship agendas. Based upon our experience with other HBCUs, we believe there are many opportunities for Grambling faculty to succeed in this arena, particularly with federal funding. However, the culture of the University must change in order for this to occur. The President must lead that culture change.
Lest readers misunderstand, we do not argue that Grambling should become a “research institution” in the traditional sense. It is not a land grant institution and we believe the University’s teaching mission and student focus should remain paramount. Even so, the maturation of the institution and its increasing programmatic responsibilities now require some reorientation of scholarly attitudes and effort. Properly construed, teaching and research are complementary activities, not substitutes. Grambling will serve its student body better if its faculty is actively engaged in research, scholarship and the pursuit of knowledge.

**Doctoral Programs**

Grambling offers three doctoral programs, two of which are offered as a part of the Louisiana Education Consortium (LEC) that includes Grambling and two of its neighboring institutions, Louisiana Tech and the University of Louisiana at Monroe (ULM). All of the doctoral programs at Grambling are located in the College of Education. The consortial programs are in Educational Leadership and Curriculum and Instruction, while the third program, in Developmental Education, is the only specific program of that type in the country.

All of Grambling’s doctoral programs are products of the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) Consent Decree/Settlement Agreement relating to the desegregation and support of Louisiana higher education. The first of these was promulgated in 1977 and the current Agreement expires in 2005. In many ways, the consent decrees represent the fond hopes of many for equity and progress in the funding and support of programs that primarily involve African Americans. Yet, they also constitute legal requirements for higher education in Louisiana. The University has received specially designated funding in the amount of approximately $1.6 million annually, beginning in 1995, to support these doctoral programs and related requirements.

In the best of all worlds, Grambling’s doctoral offerings would flourish because of: (1) healthy student enrollments; (2) faculty disciplinary research and achievements in the areas that support these programs; and, (3) the subsequent success of graduates. However, a rigorous appraisal suggests that only the third of these criteria appears to be satisfied and even there, the University has not yet produced evidence that the programs have made significant differences in the productivity of its doctoral graduates. With respect to the first two criteria, however, the evidence is clearer.

Student enrollments are small and class sections frequently enroll only a few students. In Fall 2002, for example, several “500 level” educational leadership course sections had only three students and .33 FTE faculty load time was assigned to the faculty teaching those courses. Two sections of one course were offered to a total of six students and .67 FTE faculty load credit assigned. This is very expensive instruction. Responsible administrators argue that “12 month” employees often teach these sections and thus the course is “free.” However, the same individuals could have been teaching other courses that would have enrolled far more students. There is an obvious
opportunity cost (lost student enrollment in other courses that might have been scheduled) associated with this practice. And, it is not clear how such “12 month” individuals can lead their students in research activities, or serve actively as dissertation supervisors and advisors, given their administrative responsibilities.

According to materials provided by the University, faculty publication in refereed scholarly journals in educational leadership, curriculum and instruction, developmental education, or in related disciplines, is remarkably low. Most of the faculty in the College of Education, and most of the faculty who teach in these programs, do not maintain active research programs. Many do not publish in refereed outlets, do not author books, and do not receive research grants.

We are well aware that the doctoral programs offered by Grambling State University carry with them great symbolic value and that eliminating them would be quite controversial. Even so, they are expensive, low enrollment programs that require significant expenditures for library resources and faculty load time. Further, scholarly productivity and credentials of faculty in these programs are in need of strengthening. (7) At the end of the Settlement Agreement (2005), we believe the University should carefully study whether it should continue its doctoral programs and determine the plausibility of reallocating the resources for these programs to other urgent needs on the campus. These programs are in no way essential to serving 99+ percent of the University’s students, yet are quite expensive and may well be marginal in terms of their quality.

**Distance Learning**

Like many institutions, Grambling has begun to develop distance learning courses and programs. While the University has limited past experience and only a minimal infrastructure to support distance-learning programs, the Grambling “brand name” may be worth a great deal in this crowded marketplace. In addition, the University may have unfolding opportunities for distance learning that involve the U.S. Army. Thus far, no HBCU has laid claim to leadership in distance learning and plausibly Grambling could be that institution, if it can fashion an attractive, cost effective set of programs.

Grambling has emphasized asynchronous, Internet-based distance learning courses rather than televised course delivery, though it owns a KU band satellite uplink. In Fall 2002, 18 courses were offered, with 37 scheduled for Spring 2003. 380 distinct student registrations were recorded in Fall 2002; this translates to about 20 annualized FTE, not an overwhelming number.

The University would not be able to afford its current distance learning initiatives were it not for Title III funds of about $300,000 per year. Putting this amount in perspective, the Title III subsidy alone probably amounts to about $400 per student registration. By all comparisons, this is expensive activity.
To the surprise of some, distance learning, even over the Internet, is an expensive undertaking. Numerous institutions have found their per student costs in distance learning programs to be greater than those for its bricks and mortar based programs. Further, they have found the demands distance learning students place upon faculty far exceed those of regular, bricks and mortar students. Distance learning students constantly e-mail, voice-mail, and ask questions of their distance learning faculty. Perhaps it is their remoteness that gives them the courage to do so. Whatever the reason, the typical distance learning faculty member must be assigned extra teaching load credit, both because of the increased student demand on his/her time, but also to prepare the distance learning courses.

Finally, most institutions have found that the break even point for an asynchronous distance learning course often exceeds 50 students when all relevant costs are taken into account, including support services such as library.

(8) The preceding discussion is designed to promote an atmosphere of caution as Grambling addresses its distance learning opportunities. Only a very small number of institutions nationally are making money providing distance learning. It is not clear whether Grambling possesses the ways and means of joining that select group. The President should critically evaluate the University’s current and planned activities in this arena.
IV. FACULTY

In general, Grambling’s faculty members are appropriately trained and its members typically have earned terminal degrees from large research universities. In Fall 2002, the University claimed 243 FTE faculty and only a small number of part-time faculty. While a department chairperson complained that “the percent of our permanent faculty who hold the terminal degree has fallen significantly in recent years,” the Review Team believes the percent of faculty who hold terminal degrees is adequate.

Nearly all students are highly complimentary of the faculty who teach and lead them. “They know who I am and are really concerned whether I learn,” reported an upper level student who spoke for many. “She’s the best faculty member I could ever imagine,” said another student who explained that she required lots of extra help to succeed because of her disadvantaged academic background. Numerous students reported that their faculty also “keep track of us even outside of the classroom,” though alumni believe that this practice (which they cherish) has declined over time.

Faculty members describe each other as “loyal, very committed, and dedicated to making a difference in the lives of students.” Spontaneously, they spoke enthusiastically about students they have taught who came to Grambling with less than complete collegiate preparation, but left the institution well educated and later became quite successful. “They may come to us with deficiencies, but they leave as well educated young people,” bragged a faculty member, who trumpeted the faculty’s contribution to that achievement.

Several faculty members told the visiting team that they were aware of situations where there may be a few minimally qualified instructors teaching courses. (9) The Vice President for Academic Affairs should investigate this claim and provide a report to the President. Grambling should ensure that all instructional faculty members are well qualified for their respective disciplines.

Faculty Salaries

To no one’s surprise, Grambling trails national faculty salary averages at every rank. Regrettably, this is true for many Louisiana public institutions within their respective peer groups. In Grambling’s case, it trails national average faculty salaries at other comprehensive institutions (master’s degree and limited doctoral programs) by about ten percent at the instructor and assistant professors ranks, eleven percent at the associate professor rank, and a very substantial 20 percent at the full professor rank. If that sample is restricted only to public comprehensive institutions, then the gaps between Grambling and its peers are 9,10,10, and 19 percent, respectively. However Grambling fares somewhat better when comparing salaries to the 16 Southern States (SREB).
### 2001-2002 Faculty Salaries (000's)

Source: AAUP except for GSU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Assistant Instructor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grambling State University</td>
<td>$32.2</td>
<td>$42.6</td>
<td>$51.6</td>
<td>$58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Comprehensive, Non-doctoral</td>
<td>$36.6</td>
<td>$47.4</td>
<td>$57.9</td>
<td>$73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Comprehensive, All Comprehensive</td>
<td>$36.3</td>
<td>$47.5</td>
<td>$57.8</td>
<td>$72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSU – Baton Rouge</td>
<td>$34.5</td>
<td>$52.4</td>
<td>$59.1</td>
<td>$80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Tech</td>
<td>$29.4</td>
<td>$47.6</td>
<td>$55.7</td>
<td>$65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULM</td>
<td>$30.2</td>
<td>$43.0</td>
<td>$49.3</td>
<td>$59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULL</td>
<td>$34.2</td>
<td>$44.4</td>
<td>$59.9</td>
<td>$73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern University, Baton Rouge</td>
<td>$33.1</td>
<td>$44.0</td>
<td>$52.8</td>
<td>$64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNeese State</td>
<td>$33.9</td>
<td>$39.0</td>
<td>$47.2</td>
<td>$59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>$32.6</td>
<td>$42.6</td>
<td>$52.3</td>
<td>$64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson State (MS)</td>
<td>$33.9</td>
<td>$45.2</td>
<td>$52.7</td>
<td>$58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcorn State (MS)</td>
<td>$31.6</td>
<td>$43.9</td>
<td>$48.4</td>
<td>$55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk State (VA)</td>
<td>$38.4</td>
<td>$44.3</td>
<td>$54.7</td>
<td>$60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth City (NC)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$43.5</td>
<td>$46.9</td>
<td>$59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville State (NC)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$50.2</td>
<td>$58.1</td>
<td>$68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>$34.6</td>
<td>$45.4</td>
<td>$52.2</td>
<td>$60.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Faculty Salaries by Rank vs. SREB Peers

**FY 2001/02**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>GSU 01/02 Avg. Salary</th>
<th>SREB FY 01/02 Avg. Salary</th>
<th>GSU Amt = or - SREB</th>
<th>GSU Pct = or - SREB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$58,671</td>
<td>$65,422</td>
<td>-$6,751</td>
<td>-10.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>51,577</td>
<td>53,531</td>
<td>-1,954</td>
<td>-3.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>42,569</td>
<td>45,305</td>
<td>-2,736</td>
<td>-6.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>32,157</td>
<td>35,467</td>
<td>-3,310</td>
<td>-9.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Ranks</td>
<td>$46,194</td>
<td>$49,920</td>
<td>-$3,726</td>
<td>-7.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hence, when compared to similar institutions in Louisiana and the SREB states, Grambling trails its peers by 9, 6, 4, and 10 percent, respectively, in the four ranks.

Another plausible peer group to which Grambling might be compared is other public HBCUs of similar size and scope. Reliable data are available for Jackson State, Alcorn State, Norfolk State, Elizabeth City State and Fayetteville State. Grambling’s faculty salary disadvantage with respect to this group ranges from about four percent at the instructor rank to a high of six percent at the assistant professor level. Grambling is much more competitive with respect to this group of peer institutions.
Finally, like it or not, the University competes in national markets for faculty and must compete with a wide variety of different institutions that are interested in employing the same candidates in which Grambling is interested. A non-random though appropriate sample of institutions includes Southwest Texas, Appalachian State (NC), Longwood (VA) and Delta State (MS). Grambling’s disadvantage is more pronounced with respect to these institutions and typically ranges between five and ten percent, depending upon the faculty rank. For example, Grambling trails the full professor average within this group by seven percent.

What does all of this tell us? It suggests directly that Grambling State University may find it difficult to attract and retain faculty because of its current faculty salary structure. (10) The President should make faculty salaries a high priority matter and ensure that state higher education authorities and the legislature are fully aware of where Grambling stands. If the University couples its salary requests with visible action on agenda items of interest to the Board of Supervisors, legislators and the general citizenry, it is much more likely to succeed.

We have three suggestions in this regard. First, (11) Grambling should take a forthright stand in favor of market and merit compensation for its faculty and staff. Just as faculty members do not assign every student a C-grade regardless of their performance, so also Grambling should not assign all faculty members a financial C by means of across the board increments. Grambling should demonstrate that it stands for excellence and that it is not afraid to back its rhetoric with action. Second, (12) Grambling should adopt a meaningful policy that deals with the evaluation of tenured faculty. This policy should allow for the possibility of dismissal after appropriate due process involving faculty peers. Many universities say they have such policies, but few have policies that are meaningful and actually are used. Grambling should be the exception. If it does so, it will garner widespread public approval and support. Note that we are not calling for a witch-hunt, but rather that the University provides meaningful, enforceable performance standards for its faculty. There should be opportunities for professional growth and development and for meaningful sanctions of faculty who fail to respond to remediation plans.

While a faculty evaluation system does exist at Grambling, faculty state that in some years, there has been no evaluation conducted for some faculty, or at least none of which they were aware. Further, faculty and administrators alike indicated that the University tends to be partial to “across the board” salary increments based upon a standard percent of the recipient’s salary rather than upon evaluated merit.

Even while most Grambling faculty appear to favor a “merit” system for salary increments, they also fear such a world. While we understand the bases for such anxiety to exist among faculty with respect to a merit-based salary increment system, we would like to note that nearly all of the institutions of higher education that are perceived to have even more superior reputations than Grambling maintain merit-oriented faculty and staff salary increment systems. That is, they reward most those who are evaluated and found to be best at meeting their
respective institutions’ missions. They reward least those who are evaluated and found to be unproductive.

Third, (13) Grambling’s faculty and staff evaluation and salary procedures need a thorough overhaul. The institution must state forthrightly what it values and then reward those individuals who honor those values most effectively. Grambling’s claim on state resources is damaged in legislative and public arenas if it becomes known that it is unable to assess and reward the contributions of its own faculty.
V. STUDENTS

Grambling’s 4,500 students constitute an interesting group of individuals who typically display self-confidence and good humor despite some of the recent difficulties that the University has experienced. Students are conspicuous for their loyalty to Grambling. More than 57 percent of the student body is comprised of women, a somewhat lower percentage than is true at many other HBCUs. Further, Grambling has maintained that approximate percentage for several years. This is encouraging because of the critical need for young African American men to become educated and progress.

The University’s retention of its freshman class to its sophomore year has edged above 70 percent. This is a respectable number, especially when compared with other institutions having open admissions. Many HBCUs report retention numbers considerably lower. By the same token, these retention rates do not appear to translate to high graduation rates. University data reveal that the latest six-year cohort graduation rate was only 31.3 percent. Increasing retention rates should pull up graduation rates in coming years.

The student body is relatively racially homogenous. Approximately 96 percent of all students are African American, while 3.4 percent are White, and all other groups together (including international students) approximate one percent of the student headcount. White students tend to be confined to a few disciplines (nursing is an example), or are graduate students, and very rarely live on campus. A high, but indeterminate proportion of Grambling students come from the families of alumni. Some students claim several generations of relatives who attended or graduated from Grambling in earlier years. “There was no doubt where I was going to go to school,” observed an undergraduate student who exclaimed, “Grambling is in my blood!”

Many Grambling students come to the institution with what one administrator called “a bit of baggage.” By that, she meant that some students are under-prepared for a strong collegiate experience (the mean ACT score of this fall’s entering freshmen was below 16) and that some come from dysfunctional families and/or from difficult economic circumstances. “Our task is to educate these student and to present them with standards and expectations,” commented a faculty member, who said he regards this as a noble task. “Wow, we really make a difference in many of their lives!” said a senior faculty member, who also echoed the sentiment of many faculty and staff members when he asserted that, “They’re not the same students we got 20 years ago.”

That said, numerous faculty members reported that today’s Grambling student is much more technologically savvy than students in former years. “It’s interesting,” observed a faculty member, “that some of our new students come to us with real reading problems, but these same people are rather advanced with computers. They know more than we do.”
About 10 percent of all Grambling students are pursuing a graduate degree and, in contrast to undergraduate enrollment, graduate enrollment has been growing (12 percent increase between fall 1999 and fall 2002).

Grambling’s major admissions competition comes from other HBCUs, especially Southern University. Clark Atlanta and Howard also attract applications from individuals who also consider Grambling. There is surprisingly little admissions overlap between Grambling and Louisiana Tech and UL Monroe.

In general, according to the Spring 2000 ACT Student Opinion Survey, students are reasonably satisfied with Grambling State University, even though some opinions are spiked with complaints about very poor conditions in some of the University’s residence halls, and their future alma mater’s reputation being soiled in the press because of its financial reporting problems. Students, nonetheless, are usually happy that they chose Grambling and it chose them.

Typically, students are very pleased with faculty, but much less pleased with University staff members. Faculty receive plaudits for spending extra time with students, “for their willingness to help me as long as it takes,” and their devotion to their tasks. We have seldom encountered the degree of warmth for faculty that Grambling students exhibit. On the other hand, it’s also true that we seldom have encountered the antipathy of the sort Grambling students express about the demeanor and attitudes of some of the University staff members. (14) The University President should move forward to reinforce faculty’s positive attitudes and willingness to help students while examining the reported antipathy of such in support personnel.

Declining Enrollment, Its Causes and Its Cures

In 1993, Grambling enrolled approximately 7,800 headcount students. That number is approximately 4,500 today, a 43 percent decline. The implications of this for Grambling have been painful---sharply declining tuition revenue, many fewer dollars available to support auxiliary services such as student activities and intercollegiate athletics, declining morale among some groups on campus, reduced course offerings, empty residence halls, and perhaps deferred maintenance on campus (though it is not clear if reduced enrollment is necessarily responsible).

It is difficult to separate cause and effect where Grambling’s enrollment decline is concerned. Reduced class sections, empty residence halls, declining student activity funding---all of these are both the cause and the effect of declining enrollment. Unfortunately, once enrollment begins to decline consistently, a host of problems arise and those problems in turn tend to place even more downward pressure on enrollment. Further, Grambling’s enrollment has not been helped by rumors that it might close, or the poor conditions of some of its residence halls, or the deteriorating, sometimes unkempt state of its campus (which at one time was known at least regionally for having attractive and clean buildings and grounds despite its small budget), or increased tuition and fee levels.
It is to its credit, then, that the University was able to attract approximately 1,800 new freshmen in Fall 2002. The Vice President for Enrollment Management/Academic Services and his colleagues deserve considerable credit for generating this much interest in Grambling, despite the negative media reports. Apparently consultants (Noel-Levitz), hired by the Board of Regents to assist universities in recruitment efforts, have been particularly effective at GSU. Critical to this was an increase in the number of out-of-state students, resulting from Board actions governing out-of-state tuition waivers. These policies enable Grambling to waive out-of-state tuition for many different categories of students, including alumni, individuals who have a single parent who resides in Louisiana, military personnel, and students with stronger than average academic records insofar as Grambling is concerned. (15) We believe Grambling should continue to recruit out of state students, but slowly and gradually grant a smaller proportion of out of state tuition waivers. The institution badly needs the additional tuition revenue that out of state students can provide and its current policy is, in essence, to give away much of that potential revenue in the form of fee-waiver scholarships. As the University improves its campus, stabilizes its financial reporting, and enhances its general attractiveness, it should be able to attract more “full pay” out of state students, or at least to grant some of these students only one-half waivers.

Speaking more generally, however, the very best things that could happen to the University’s student recruitment efforts is for Grambling to stabilize its financial accounting/reporting problems, improve its buildings and grounds, and develop and impart an image of a well-managed university. Students flock to success and Grambling as an institution needs to demonstrate that success consistently. The University must project an image that recent improvements in financial reporting will be sustained. That, in turn, should result in favorable consideration by COC/SACS to remove the “probation” sanction and ultimately reaffirm accreditation.

The Residence Halls

There is hardly any area more symbolic of Grambling’s difficulties than its residence halls. In general, their physical condition ranges from acceptable to uninhabitable. Although many residence halls on campuses across the country and in Louisiana are outdated, many have begun new modern facilities through a variety of private/public financing arrangements. With support and encouragement from the Board of Supervisors, Grambling’s current plan is to invite private entrepreneurs to construct new student housing, which the entrepreneurs then would operate on a profit and loss basis. Grambling then will raze several of its most dysfunctional residence halls over the next few years. Approximately 1,600 new beds will be constructed as the process unfolds. We believe this is a sound plan and encourage the University to move forward in this area.

That said, even a highly skilled entrepreneurial firm will fail at this task if the entrepreneur (and, of course, the University) cannot change student behavior in the residence halls. We received numerous reports from students of “doors kicked in,” “telephones ripped from walls,” “plumbing that is ruined and no longer works,” and a series of other incidents unbefitting of a typical university student. Our own inspection of the University’s residence halls
suggests that at some point, the institution seems to have thrown up its hands and given up attempting to master the situation. Consequently, the residence halls have been damaged to the point that the institution now regards several as unfixable.

The individuals assigned to the supervision of residence halls have not succeeded in their responsibilities. There may well be extenuating circumstances that reduce the culpability of the individuals involved. For example, it was reported that there were at one point 64 FTE supervisors in the residence halls, whereas only 24 such positions exist currently. Also, it was alleged that 30 custodial positions have been reduced to 21. We are unable to determine if these reductions are the cause or the effect of problems in the residence halls, but they are worthy of note.

(16) Whatever the causes of the residence hall problems, they represent a conspicuous institutional lack of success and this is a situation that must be reversed which may require a change in Student Services leadership. Grambling cannot attract and retain students if its primary on-campus living facilities “are up for grabs,” as a faculty member described them. Fortunately, there is a mindset to address this as a high priority. “Improving our housing situation is very close to our highest priority over the next few years,” in the eyes of a senior administrator.

(17) On a positive note, Grambling has employed a new head for its campus security forces—-an individual who is experienced, mature, and familiar with Grambling. He has pledged to enforce the law and to improve the situation in the residence halls and throughout the campus. We applaud the message this hiring sends and encourage the University to move forward. Grambling must not tolerate inappropriate behavior on any part of its campus. The residence halls are no exception.

**Intercollegiate Athletics**

Grambling State University is a member of the Southwest Athletic Conference (SWAC), a league that competes at the Division I-AA level in the NCAA. Grambling offers 17 intercollegiate sports, ranging from football and basketball to track, golf, softball and tennis. Without question, however, “the football program rules the roost” in the words of an administrator. The football program apparently does not make money for the University, though it might if the revenue were included that the University receives when the football team plays in the various “Classics” in large stadiums around the country. Without this revenue, however, the FY 2003 budget forecasts only $140,000 in net revenues from the football team and its contests. The Football Tigers do not attract large crowds at home; the first three home contests this year attracted an average of 9,436 fans, less than one-half of stadium capacity. If this trend were to continue, the intercollegiate athletic budget would be in deficit.

The big money, then, is in the “Classics.” Already this year, the football Tigers have played the Silver
Dollar Classic in Las Vegas, where they defeated Tennessee State University and received a $150,000 financial guarantee. Prime among the classics, however, is the Bayou Classic, which is played each year in New Orleans against traditional rival Southern University. The Bayou Classic has attracted more than 80,000 fans on occasion and nearly always is a big draw. We will return to the Bayou Classic.

Grambling subsidizes its intercollegiate athletic programs to the tune of about $2.38 million in the form of a transfer from the University’s educational and general fund. This appears to be the maximum permitted by the Board of Regents. While we understand the traditional importance and impact of intercollegiate athletics at Grambling, we must point out that these are funds that could be used for other purposes, including badly needed maintenance and repair of the campus. Supporters of the University’s athletic endeavors respond to this hypothetical choice by saying that (in the words of a senior faculty member) “we might be much worse off than we are in enrollment if we didn’t have a strong football team and marching band.” True, but nonetheless, the goal of the President of Grambling should be to reduce the size of this budget transfer, or at the very least, to ensure that it does not increase in size as the years pass. Intercollegiate athletic programs should gradually become responsible for generating more of the funds necessary for their own support and ideally should not be competing with academic programs for funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2002</th>
<th>FY 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$1.602 m.</td>
<td>$2.025 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>$4.216 m.</td>
<td>$4.588 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Deficit</td>
<td>$2.614 m.</td>
<td>$2.563 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;G Transfer</td>
<td>$2.255 m.</td>
<td>$2.383 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Deficit</td>
<td>$0.359 m.</td>
<td>$0.280 m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are five other issues associated with Grambling athletics that deserve additional attention. First, while football is the leading sport at Grambling (approximately three-fourths of men’s intercollegiate athletic expenditures are devoted to football) and the men’s and women’s basketball teams attract a good deal of attention and financial support from the University, some of the institution’s other teams “live below the athletic poverty line” (in the words of an athlete). Fund allocations to teams in the typical “minor” sports such as golf or tennis are very small by any standard. Consequently, coaches, players and cheerleaders supplied us with numerous instances of their having to pay out-of-pocket for reasonable expenses, including required travel and equipment. While we were unable to talk to all athletes on all teams, we are convinced that a problem does exist here. The President
should ensure that equity exists among intercollegiate athletic teams and athletes.

Related to this is a second problem. (20) A review of the Grambling operating budget reveals that only $1.011 million (29 percent) is allocated to women’s intercollegiate athletic programs, while $2.492 million (71 percent) is allocated to men’s intercollegiate athletic programs. Since the student body is 57 percent female, there is a need to review proportionality of participation of men versus women to ensure compliance with Title IX. The President should address this matter promptly.

(21) Third, the Legislative Auditor indicated a need for reconciliation of athletic ticket sales revenues to actual attendance. In his financial audit dated 25 September 2002, Dr. Daniel G. Kyle noted, “GSU has not implemented reconciliation procedures governing its athletic ticket revenues....” Such reconciliation will ensure both that all revenues are properly recorded and that future budgets will be based upon accurate data. The University President should make certain this occurs.

(22) Fourth, the team uncovered more questions than answers where the non-University sources of funding for intercollegiate athletics are concerned. Some of that outside funding comes from the Grambling University Athletic Foundation (GUAF), which exists to support Grambling’s athletic programs. It is not immediately clear as to the extent to which the University actually controls the activities of the GUAF. Without question, the GUAF should be answerable to the President of the University, despite its status as an outside corporate entity. In no case should it pursue an agenda independent of the President, the University, or the Board of Supervisors. The President should ensure that this is the case and make the GUAF’s financial statements widely and easily available.

(23) Fifth, one of the most confusing topics at Grambling is the financial structure of the annual Bayou Classic, where Grambling’s financial participation appears to be exercised via its alumni organization. Acting President Warner and the Board of Supervisors already have taken steps to make these financial arrangements more open. Nonetheless, we have great misgivings about the current structure and believe that it should be the University, and not its alumni association, which plans, operates and controls Grambling’s participation in the Bayou Classic. While statutory restrictions necessitate the use of an outside affiliate for television broadcasting, financial guarantees, and certain other phases of the activity, it is recommended that the University have ultimate control of the revenues and expenses. The President must be accountable and knowledgeable about these expenditures so as to ensure that the University and its students are reaping the maximum benefit.
The University Health Service and Related Programs

Our interviews with a variety of campus personnel suggest that the University’s Health Service is struggling with a small budget and burgeoning demands for its services. Since the Health Service budget is based predominantly on student fee revenues, Grambling’s enrollment problems have diminished the Service’s ability to serve the campus. It no longer can contemplate giving free flu shots or even supplying students with free aspirin and other common aids. Part-time students do not pay the health fee, but they use the Service, as do non-paying faculty and staff. (24) A detailed examination of the Health Service is beyond the scope of this report; however, the President should commission an examination of what the University is doing in the area of Health Services, what it would like to do, and the estimated cost of doing so. The Health Service is directly related to campus welfare and morale.

Student Body Diversity

While the faculty of Grambling State University is quite diverse in terms of backgrounds and ethnicity, the University’s student body is much less diverse. True, some 40 percent of the freshmen class hails from outside of Louisiana. However, there are relatively few White students (3.4 percent in Fall 2002), Hispanic students (0.2 percent), Asian students (0.1 percent) and international students (1.6 percent). This is problematic for the same reasons the absence of African American students is problematic at “majority” institutions. Students lose the opportunity to learn from those different from them when their classes are essentially homogeneous. This is a particularly important concern in the case of Grambling, since its students will graduate into a world in which African Americans are a distinct minority nationally. It is plausible to assert that Grambling students would be better prepared for that world if they had more collegiate contact with White, Hispanic, and Asian students.

Beyond this educational rationale, however, there is the matter of the law. Grambling is a public university that must be open and accessible to students of all ethnic background. There are hints that this is not the case. Grambling’s admissions materials and its written admissions strategies focus almost solely upon African-American students. This is despite the fact that the most recent Settlement Agreement requires Grambling to have one admissions counselor who is solely devoted to recruiting “other race” students---in this case, white students.

Grambling’s admissions practice appears to hold to such an extent that we must observe that were a majority institution to focus its admissions materials and strategies to this extent on majority students, nearly all would agree that such an institution would be breaking both the letter and spirit of the law. Our limited interviewing of White and Asian students and faculty suggested that, as one student expressed it, “This is a tough place for us to go to school.” Grambling makes little effort to recruit non-African American students and even less effort to retain them once they arrive on campus. (25) We believe this must change and recommend that the President devise and implement a more inclusive admissions strategy that is befitting a public university. Grambling is and
always will be an HBCU and it is not our intent to alter this schema. Nonetheless, it should become more
diverse, inclusive, and accepting of students from other ethnic groups, especially Whites, but also Hispanics,
Asians and international students of all ethnic backgrounds.

Admissions Standards

Throughout its history, Grambling State University has operated as an open admissions institution. Practically speaking, this has meant that any individual possessing a high school diploma or equivalent would be admitted. A majority of faculty, staff and alumni favor the continuation of this policy, though there are many dissenters among those groups. A resounding majority of students, however, favor the continuation of an open admissions policy. “That is the reason I’m here,” commented a Grambling freshman, who claimed to speak for many other students.

The aforementioned OCR Settlement Agreement of 1994 granted Grambling exemption from the general state University of Louisiana policy of gradually increasing admissions standards, but only through the end of December 2005. Between 2006 and 2010, Grambling and Southern University – New Orleans are expected to move, albeit incrementally, to satisfy selective admissions standards. These standards are minimal when viewed in a national context, but substantial in the context of the State of Louisiana, which registers ACT scores slightly below the national average. The uncomfortable reality is that some Louisiana high schools do not produce graduates who immediately are highly competitive academically.

Grambling attracts approximately 60 percent of its new freshmen from the pool of Louisiana high school graduates. It currently does not enroll large numbers of nontraditional students, though those numbers are rising. Given Grambling’s traditions, it tends to draw a number of its entering freshmen from the bottom one-half of the Louisiana high school academic distribution, at least as measured by the ACT or SAT. Thus, while the mean ACT score nationally is approximately 21, it has ranged between 15 and 16 for entering freshmen at Grambling State University.

Therefore, if Grambling does move away from its current open admissions policy, it is possible it could lose some students who otherwise might attend. (26) Nonetheless, we believe the University should gradually move away from its current open admissions standard, beginning in 2005. There are several reasons for this. First, some of the truly under-prepared students who currently attend Grambling should instead begin their academic careers on one of the campuses of the state’s expanding community college system. This is a traditional and primary function of a community college system. (27) Grambling should develop detailed transfer protocols with community colleges in Louisiana and cultivate them as sources of transfer students. An elected official was forthright in advising, “Grambling should not attempt to duplicate our community college system.”
Second, significantly under-prepared students are expensive students, both for Grambling and for the State of Louisiana, because of the extra resources they consume. Grambling should devote its scarce resources to students who are more likely to benefit as a consequence.

Third, higher admissions standards will, according to a Grambling administrator, “probably help us with the behavior and damage problems we have in the dorms.” It appears that some students are admitted to the University who perhaps are not serious about their academic work and therefore tend to misbehave when living in Grambling’s residence halls. Further, according to several students, “We have students living in my dorm who stopped going to class a long time ago and are only here for their financial aid.” Grambling administrators should investigate that assertion. Regardless, it seems likely that enhanced admissions standards will improve the atmosphere in the institution’s residence halls and diminish the level of damage imposed by students in recent years.

Fourth, Grambling is a member of the University of Louisiana System and should endeavor to satisfy all of the System’s expectations for admission standards. It should not seek numerous exceptions to Master Plan Admissions Criteria, especially where academic standards and rigor are concerned.

Fifth, modestly higher admissions standards (and, in a national context, the Master Plan Admissions Criteria may be modest) will improve Grambling’s sometimes-shaky public image. Increased admissions standards can be embraced by many as an indication that Grambling has become even more serious about its future.

Sixth, a significant proportion of faculty and alumni (though not a majority) favor upgrading standards. “It’s high time we raised our standards a bit,” offered a young alumnus, who argued that the University ought to adopt an admissions standard that would combine an applicant’s high school grade point average and her ACT score in order to determine admission.

Seventh, Grambling should consider admissions contracts whereby it defers the admission of some applicants until they have completed a given number of credit hours at a community college with satisfactory grades. That is, in the words of a faculty member, “We should challenge them to show us they belong in our community.”

(28) In sum, we recommend that Grambling begin to satisfy Master Plan Admissions Criteria (Selective III) in 2005. It has time to prepare for such a move and will not suffer an enrollment decline if its recruitment efforts between now and then continue to be as productive as they were this past year.
VI. BUDGET AND FINANCE

Before addressing the University’s well-publicized budgetary and financial reporting travails, it is appropriate to consider the overall level of the University’s funding. More precisely, how much money does Grambling receive from the State of Louisiana and is this amount adequate?

There is no denying that for many years Grambling was not funded well and that it was funded less on a per student basis than “majority” public institutions in Louisiana. A segregated society produced a segregated system of higher education that was “separate and unequal,” according to a national higher education authority. Vestiges of this circumstance remained even into the 1990s, not only where operating support was concerned, but also in terms of funded capital projects.

However, this situation began to change with the onset of the first version of the Consent Decree (1977), which ultimately forbade the State of Louisiana to cut Grambling’s operating budget. Since the University’s enrollment has fallen dramatically in recent years, its budget has not been reduced, and this has had the effect of producing a significant increase in Grambling’s state operating support per student. Grambling now receives approximately $6,000 in state general fund support per FTE student, which represents an approximate 100 percent increase in eight years. During the same time period, all public universities in Louisiana received operating budget increases that approximated 40 percent and their average now trails Grambling by about 25 percent. In addition, Grambling has received $1.6 million per year in special funding as a result of the 1994 Settlement Agreement to support specific academic programs on campus, e.g., its doctoral programs. Hence, Grambling has been a favored institution in recent years, reversing decades of neglect.

We hasten to point out that $6,000 in state general fund support per FTE student is not an exceedingly generous amount of state funding when viewed within a national perspective. The two public HBCUs in Virginia (Virginia State and Norfolk State) receive about $10,000 per FTE student. The truth is that Louisiana does not fund its institutions of higher education as well as the rest of the nation. Even so, in the context of Louisiana, Grambling is generously funded. It would appear to have adequate resources to accomplish its mission. (29) Hence, we believe Grambling personnel should minimize their complaints about “under-funding” and instead concentrate upon using the University’s $44.5 million operating budget (not including auxiliary enterprises) as productively as possible. Harsh as this recommendation may seem, the facts suggest Grambling has sufficient financial resources to operate at very respectable levels. By our reading, it also appears that the institution has available several million dollars of unencumbered funds that it can use to improve its situation. What it needs to do now is focus, prioritize, and manage its resources much more efficiently than it ever has in the past. Indeed, Grambling has a greater ability than most institutions to do rational planning and decision-making because the Settlement Agreement protects it from substantial financial reverses.
Let us provide an illustration of an area where there is progress to be made. Consider that over the past eight years, Grambling’s enrollment has declined by more than 40 percent. While the University did implement a lay-off plan which resulted in the termination of many classified and unclassified employees, a further analysis of staff productivity and additional right-sizing efforts will be necessary.

(30) Grambling’s higher administration, with the explicit cooperation and support of the Board of Supervisors, must restore discipline and prioritization to the institution’s planning and spending. This will require unpopular decisions, no doubt involving the termination of some employees. This must be among the highest priorities of the President.

The Audit and Related Matters

The general facts of Grambling’s audit situation are rather well known. For a variety of reasons, the University failed to receive an unqualified audit opinion for four years. As a consequence, COC/SACS placed Grambling on probation and that probation remains in force in November 2002. If this probation is not ultimately removed, then the institution could lose its regional accreditation. This, in turn, would almost surely lead to a significant decline in enrollment because Grambling students would no longer qualify for federal financial aid. The result would be fiscal chaos and perhaps even the closure of the institution.

We believe COC/SACS will ultimately remove Grambling’s probationary status, assuming its receives a second unqualified opinion and addresses existing findings from this year’s audit. Assuming that occurs, Grambling must ensure that it does not allow its financial affairs to deteriorate once again to the precarious situation observed only a year ago. Campus personnel must not take the attitude that “this problem has been solved”.

Another reality is that Grambling already has picked most of the low hanging fruit as it has moved to improve its financial situation. Now, it must maintain the momentum and retain skilled employees to continue progress in its financial operations. (31) Grambling must continue to change its culture within all departments and units that initiate expenditures and expend budgets. Suffice it to say that what we are talking about is an all-campus effort. Vice President Owens, who is the University’s seventh chief financial officer since 1993, commented that “we need a full blown audit forever.” This was a dramatic way to express the need for the institution to adopt and maintain rigorous financial standards on a permanent basis, and for the University’s financial personnel and auditors to establish and maintain continuous accountability.
VII. ADMINISTRATION

There were complaints about administrative services and staff in all areas; concerns were raised about both attitude and competence. With the exception of the Finance office, where dramatic change is already in progress, review and reform should be an early order of business for the President.

Administrative Structure

The current administrative organizational structure is not rational and could not be explained logically to Review team members. There appear to be twelve direct reports to the President (see organizational chart below), which are excessive. There is no line advancement division; rather, advancement is a staff function under the Executive Assistant to the President. (32) Athletics not only plays a unique role at Grambling but there remain many questions about the finances and administration and issues regarding minor sports and gender equity. We believe the Director of Athletics should continue to report to the President in order to allow closer review. Administrative reorganization is needed. Roles of other existing staff need more definition and justification. It is especially important that regular and systematic evaluations be conducted of all staff with attention devoted to individual accountability. Virtually all of the other staff functions under the President could, and probably should, be re-assigned to one of the existing line officers, or eliminated.
Accepting the unique mission of GSU, it is understandable that administrative costs are relatively higher than other institutions, but Grambling costs are not only higher than other Louisiana institutions but significantly higher than other comparable HBCUs. Indeed, revenues often appear to be disproportionately allocated to areas not directly related to student or faculty services.

In general, faculty and students felt that the administration was not sensitive enough to their needs. In part, an explanation for these expressed sentiments may be the frequency of staff turnover; many are relatively new to their positions and are carrying out multiple responsibilities while others have less demanding roles.

(33) It appears that the administration has not been effective in its communication with the University community. This issue must be addressed by the President. Certainly, the President faces a challenge in turning around the organization, personnel and general tone of the administration.

Physical Plant

While the situation has improved in recent months, Grambling still does not perform some routine administrative tasks as well as it should, or (as our observation suggests) as well as most other institutions of higher education. It does cut the grass on its lawns, and tend its grounds, but they are “frequently shaggy” (the words of a faculty member) and our own perusal of the grounds confirmed this judgment.

Particularly problematic are facilities management in general and the spotty janitorial and cleaning work in classroom buildings in particular. One building will evince pride of ownership and a staff that seems vitally concerned that the building be kept clean and attractive. Trash and graffiti are removed in a timely fashion, rest rooms are cleaned regularly and classrooms and offices are tended regularly. Then, unfortunately, another building will suggest quite the opposite. It will be dirty, sometimes even filthy, in certain locations and there is no sense that anyone cares or that the staff have claimed ownership for their building. Much (if not most) seems to depend upon the identity of those responsible for cleaning the building in question. Some are dedicated, energetic and full of pride about their facility. Other staff individuals seem not to care, are classic slackers and “are hard to find,” according to other staff and faculty.

The differences in the upkeep of these buildings (and throughout the remainder of the campus) seem to relate to the quality of supervision of building employees. It is apparent that some supervisors have not been as vigilant as they should. (34) The Vice President for Finance and the President must attack this problem head on, set standards and then refuse to accept inadequate performance. “Employees either must perform at an acceptable level or they should be terminated,” stated a spirited alumnus. (35) And, if it has been the case that some supervisors have been afraid to discipline or terminate uncooperative and unproductive employees, then that, too, must end. At the same time, the President should ask the State of Louisiana to review pay grades
and rates for the skilled tradesmen the institution so badly needs. The goal should be to pay good people for their good work and to change or dispense with the rest.

(36) We also recommend that Grambling take the first steps to develop a campus physical master plan to describe the maintenance, repair and renovation of the existing campus, along with future campus architecture, construction and additions. Experienced, outside expertise should be employed to assist the University in this regard.

Administrative Stability

We believe that an important source of Grambling’s problems in recent years has been its high levels of administrative instability. There has been frequent turnover in administrative posts and the consequences have been severe. As a national higher education authority charitably put it, “Grambling has lost ground over the past dozen years because of the unusually high turnover of its senior staff.” This has evidenced itself in timid, inwardly directed leadership, a highly political atmosphere, a dearth of innovation and the inability to attract and retain staff at all levels.

(37) It is important for the permanent President to identify his/her administrative team as quickly as possible and that these individuals be highly talented, strong, experienced individuals. Tested consultants should be appointed and national searches conducted and only the most closely referenced and best qualified candidates appointed. The University should resolve to pay external market salaries to attract and then retain the exceptional individuals required. The price of doing so may be considered steep by some; however, consider that the price to be paid is infinitely higher if mediocre individuals are appointed and excessive turnover continues. Plainly speaking, Grambling must not risk its future by fielding an administrative team that is of questionable talent and turns over frequently. Administrative stability will, almost by itself, help solve many of the University’s problems.

The “Inbred” Issue

One of Grambling’s indubitable strengths is the generational devotion of its graduates to their alma mater. Grambling graduates are grateful to the institution for the chance it provided them and for its contribution to their success. Many enjoyed their Grambling experience so much, and are so grateful, that they jump at the chance to return to the Grambling campus, sometimes even for positions that pay them considerably less than they might earn elsewhere.

Most universities employ some of their alumni as faculty, staff and administrators. The “alums know the history of a place and are strongly committed to its success,” according to the leader of a national higher education
organization. “They help connect one generation to another,” he continued.

Nonetheless, the same individual warned that institutions must guard against appointing too many of their alumni to positions within the institution. The problem is that many alumni may regard the institution as they have known it as the natural order of things and may not be ready to challenge what they see. Further, they may not be able to draw upon the experiences that non-alumni have. “Outsiders” bring with them a diverse set of backgrounds, ideas and experiences that can prove to be highly useful, particularly in an institution that is seeking new and better ways of doing things.

Optimally, an institution will mix a judicious number of appointments of alumni with a visible majority of individuals who are outsiders. A concern, as we see it, is that Grambling has tended to hire too many alumni. By way of illustration, in the latest edition of the Grambling Catalog, 55 administrators are listed. 35 have Grambling degrees. We believe this is excessive and hypothesize that this phenomenon is one of several reasons why Grambling has experienced problems over the years. Alumni “don’t want to blow the whistle” on their alma mater (according to an alumna) and sometimes do not have sufficient outside experience to be able to propose alternative solutions to problems that arise.

(38) While it will not be popular, we recommend that the President place firm controls upon the number of Grambling graduates that are employed and that for the foreseeable future, those hiring be required to demonstrate that they have sought non-Grambling candidates for positions and that they have given them appropriate consideration. This may sound like “affirmative action for outsiders” and in a sense it is. But, it is necessary at this juncture in the University’s history.
VIII. TECHNOLOGY

The most appropriate adjective to apply to the state of technology at Grambling is “spotty.” Because of the availability of federal funding (often Title III) and Settlement Agreement funding from the State of Louisiana, some areas of the University are doing much better than others where technology is concerned. In the domain of instructional technology, for example, Education appears to be doing rather well, while several of the departments within the social sciences and humanities appear to be fairing considerably less well.

In general, every faculty member and every administrator or staff member who wants a microcomputer has one. Most faculty members (though certainly not all) have reasonably up to date PCs and at least minimally appropriate software. (Grambling is a Microsoft campus.) Administrators and staff usually have PCs, but these machines may be obsolete.

The University appears to have an adequate number of PCs available for student use on campus within established laboratories. At least one laboratory is paid for and controlled by students. Grambling’s Information Technology backbone is adequate, but the T-1 line to the outside world is hardly considered high speed in a national context. The University will be forced to make significant investments in this area in the future if it wishes even to maintain what it currently offers.

Grambling is a user of Blackboard, the nationally utilized software that enables faculty members to establish web pages for their classes, carry out efficient e-mail conversations with students, make electronic assignments, etc. Actual faculty use of Blackboard is problematically low, however, and most faculty members confessed that they do not use it despite its utility and availability. One reason is a lack of training, which is reflective of a shortage of trained computer and technology personnel on campus.

A major concern on the campus is in the area of administrative computing where Grambling has chosen to rely significantly upon SCT’s “Banner” software. Banner is widely used throughout the United States, but it is well known that productive use requires training and experience. Neither has been present in sufficient quantities at Grambling and one of the institution’s most egregious failures occurred when it rushed its implementation of Banner and consequently lost some months of critical financial transactions. While it is true that the institution overcame this particular information debacle in achieving its unqualified audit opinion, nonetheless, it also remains true that a surprisingly small number of individuals on campus actually know how to effectively use the Banner system. Some offices actually maintain their records on an Excel spreadsheet because they lack the knowledge and skill on how to use Banner appropriately. (39) The President should ensure that Banner training is renewed and extended. The institution’s goal should be to make all appropriate personnel Banner literate within 18 months.
Banner is not the only major administrative system that is in need of improvement. Student registration procedures are definitely “20th century” where on-line and touch-tone telephone registration opportunities do not exist. Payment procedures are “antiquated” in the eyes of an expert and there is “way too much paper being handled and misplaced throughout the University.”

(40) We also recommend that the President find the financial ways and means to employ additional technology and IRC support personnel for deployment throughout the institution. The President also should examine the leadership and the mission of the IRC, both of which receive indifferent evaluations from campus constituents. Further, the President should identify, from internal sources and grant and gift funds, the dollars necessary to bring the University’s various administrative software packages and business routines up to date. Given the central nature of Grambling to HBCU education and its brand name, we believe an active, energetic, charismatic President can sell such an investment to a major national foundation.
IX. INSTITUTIONAL ADVANCEMENT AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

Significant increases in private support will be imperative in the future for Grambling State University, yet advancement appears to be extremely fragmented and below average at almost every level. In face-to-face interviews with individuals and groups and in myriad written communications from key members of the community, the core problem that surfaces is that the overall advancement function has never been a top priority. Heavy turnover in the President’s office and leaders spread too thin to provide adequate involvement or leadership usually contribute to a weak program. Although there appears to be confidence in the current acting President’s ability to solicit private dollars for the University, there has been inadequate, fragmented, and/or non-existent involvement in the past. As a result, an environment has been created in which everyone faults someone or everyone else for the insufficient acquisition of funds for the University. Institutional advancement coordination is nonexistent and operations are shrouded in mystery. Indeed, getting information about this area was difficult.

In such an environment, advancement—the functions of government, media, alumni, public relations, and fund raising—will suffer. The perception of advancement at Grambling State by those who are knowledgeable is that it is poor and inadequately led. Overall fund-raising practices are so fragmented that accurate five-year fund-raising performance data could not be obtained. It is the perception of most that the overall advancement program at Grambling is in need of major restructuring. This is acknowledged by observers of advancement in and outside the University, and by those who are responsible for the conduct of each of its activities. Improvement can only be accomplished with a dedicated chief executive officer and a competent chief advancement officer.

(41) The lessons of “best advancement practices” at other public institutions are threefold. First, a foundation board must be actively involved in the advancement effort of the institution. Fundraising cannot be merely delegated to staff, no matter how pivotal a role they may play in the execution. Foundation board members can and must raise money for their institution. Second, the foundation board, the president, and the professional(s) in charge of the basic functions of advancement—namely alumni relations, communications (incorporating university and government relations) and fund raising—must work as an integrated team, led by the President. Finally, the people in charge of these three principal advancement functions must be broad-gauged and competent professionals who enjoy the respect of the academic community they exist to serve. The absence of any one of these characteristics will seriously weaken any institutional advancement program.

(42) The most pressing need on campus is to restructure, reorganize, define responsibility for, and recruit appropriate talent—both for a foundation board and the advancement staff. Until that task is undertaken successfully, the involvement of a committed permanent President is apt to be marginalized. “Too much hiring has been done for political reasons,” said one Board member of the now defunct GU Foundation. A graduate and long-time supporter of Grambling said, “Alumni want to support Grambling but they get so many mixed signals. The alumni office and the alumni association aren’t always on the same page.”
Problems with the Foundation are an extension of the recent management problems of the University leading to a declaration of bankruptcy on the part of the Foundation in 2001. It now appears that most fundraising occurs via the Grambling University National Alumni Association (GUNAA), Grambling University Athletic Foundation, Quarterback Club, Tiger Club, and Office of Grants and Contracts. Very little fundraising activity is actually attributed to the Office of Development.

Confusion exists on campus and in the community regarding responsibility and accountability. The GUNAA claims “tremendous success” (see below) when discussing alumni fundraising. Similarly, the Athletic Foundation, Quarterback Club, and Tiger Club boast of similar success. However, there is no unified approach and solicitations are poorly coordinated and often repetitive.

Reviewers urgently requested audit reports on collegiate fund-raising. The GUNAA finally produced an audited financial statement for the period ending December 2001. One week following the visit, reviewers received a three-year report for the Tiger Annual Fund Campaign (FY ‘00 – 730 donors, $885,264; FY ‘01– 887 donors, $819,866; FY ‘02 – 789 donors, $721,071). The lack of quality software contributes to the lack of an efficient operation.

(43) The administration of the University, it appears, has not only delegated most fund raising responsibility to “affiliated organizations,” but has failed to maintain adequate accountability and control. This must change immediately.

Donors, professors, and staff echo one observer’s comment that as a whole, the different affiliated groups are “a group of really nice people with good intentions…but they are not properly trained, not focused, not unified, not involved in the right stuff, and not nearly giving to their potential.” Another stated, “The Grambling University Foundation should be the corporate all-star team of executives from the area and they should have their time utilized wisely and be motivated to make the University a top priority.”

A reconstituted and energized Foundation Board of Directors that is thoroughly educated in its responsibilities, in agreement with the strategic direction for the institution, and committed to its chief executive officer will ensure an advancement program that can tap its vast potential of material and moral support. (44) A new Foundation Board of Directors must be recruited and trained to take responsibility for the fundraising performance of the institution.

(45) At an institution such as Grambling, with its great history and tattered recent past, the President must exercise control over the reins of the institutional advancement program, and be a viable and forceful leader setting the priorities of the advancement effort. While the Foundation Board must be fully vested in the
advancement program’s overall objectives, its management falls under the responsibility of the President, the one who should be ultimately accountable. Heavy turnover in the President’s position and extended controversy have diluted the President’s advancement time and meant that no commitment to a single set of priorities could be achieved. As voiced by a number of constituents, “Too many presidents and too many changed priorities mean an inefficient use of staff time and poor quality results. A lot of time has been spent introducing new presidents to key people, but the players would change over and over again and it would disrupt the normal cultivation schedule.”

(46) It is imperative that the President reaches out to the community through personal communications. The Foundation Board must open the necessary doors to ensure that this occurs. Implicit in extending ties to the region and state are at least three components—namely, a relationship with the immediate community, the greater business community, and ongoing contact with the press, especially the print and broadcast media in the “major” media markets that constitute the larger Grambling State service area. These contacts need to include the Vice Presidents and other leaders of the University as well, so that people know the Grambling State leadership personally and also see it as coherent and mutually supportive.

The Advancement Programs

(47) There is little evidence of support for the work of the development area from staff and faculty. This has resulted in some offices and departments conducting “mini-campaigns” on their own without involving the development staff. This practice should be stopped immediately.

As noted above, fund raising and development activities at Grambling are relatively modest and only in the last few years has the institution begun to take such efforts seriously. Many individuals describe these activities as “young” and “just getting off the ground.” For many years, these functions did not receive serious attention or support and, in addition, a high degree of employee turnover discouraged development and continuity. Two of the Presidents in the past 15 years gave this area increased attention and planted productive seeds. However, the heavy turnover in Presidents often disrupted momentum and productivity. Certainly, another reason for this is the lack of available time created by the accreditation and fiscal problems.

It also appears that Grambling’s fund-raising is relatively expensive. That is, data supplied to the team suggest the University spends a great deal to raise rather little. Over the past few years, this has ranged from a low of 39 percent to a high of 83 percent of funds raised. These are very high fund raising cost levels, though the youthful nature of fund raising at Grambling and weak management systems undoubtedly account for some of this situation. We understand that fund raising is “just getting out of the training wheels on the tricycle stage of development” (according to a well placed alumnus), but this underlines a degree of neglect that this most important task has suffered from recently.

“They haven’t begun to realize their potential in fund raising,” reflected a regional legislator. He also added
that “I’ve never been asked for a gift even though nearly everyone else in the world tries to put a hit on me for money.” An area business leader with long ties to Grambling stated, “Nearly everything in the fundraising operation is in need of expansion, upgrading, and reorientation—mission, expectations, personnel, materials, goals—and, most importantly, accountability.”

There should be particular concern about the substance of the currently discussed fund-raising campaign. Other than some of the projects being “highly visible feel good” projects, there is little evidence of commitment to such an effort, and the program itself can hardly be justified in light of the operational and deferred maintenance needs of the entire campus. In fact, (48) the campus has tens of millions of dollars in deferred maintenance needs. A plan must be developed to address these needs and should be a high priority in the overall fund-raising plan.

While we found individuals in the development office to be committed, their credentials and organizational abilities were limited and fragmented. As noted earlier, the instability of the presidency over an extended period has been a major roadblock in this process. If our assumptions regarding the presidency are accepted, strong commitment to a “new” advancement office should commence immediately.

(49) We believe the University would be well advised to engage outside professionals on an ongoing basis to evaluate its fund-raising activities, costs and potential and to counsel the institution on future courses of action. Further, the University should move rapidly to improve its relationships with, and fundraising from, alumni and major corporate donors.

Alumni Relations

The alumni office records boast of 35,000 living alumni. The Grambling University National Alumni Association contends the actual figure is closer to 10,000, stating that 25,000 others are “attendees who haven’t graduated.” The GUNAA claims an active membership of over 2,000. Both the alumni office and GUNAA indicate that participation rates do not include individuals involved with the Grambling University Athletic Foundation. Staffers were pressed to accurately estimate an alumni participation rate (some say 20 percent, others 10 percent), but couldn’t easily account for total alumni dollars raised. This confusion is reflected in the comments of an alumnus at GSU, who said, “Even on simple stuff, the left hand doesn’t know what the right hand is doing. As a result, nobody knows what is right.” Based on the data we were presented, it appears that the true annual alumni giving rate is well below five percent; abnormally low.

(50) Unlike most institutions, Grambling does not report data to the Council for Aid to Education (CAE) so it is impossible to make comparisons to peers. It should begin doing so immediately. GSU does not even keep an all-inclusive comprehensive development report in CAE format for internal purposes. Membership and funds generated by the GUNAA (approximately $971,000 in FY ’01) suggest a recent increase
in alumni participation, but the folding of the Foundation and negative public relations about financial management at the University could have a negative impact if not addressed immediately.

The University reports an impressive number of over 50 alumni “chapters.” However, deeper analysis indicates little involvement by officials of GSU with most chapters. (51) The institution must move quickly to properly organize alumni chapters and develop activities in areas where significant numbers of alumni live. Alumni can provide critical financial support, help recruit and place students, and provide important introductions to individuals of influence. In return, alumni can benefit from friendships, networking, and the feeling that “they are supporting a winner.”

Grambling has attempted to develop viable chapter programs in recent years, but these efforts are relatively outdated when compared to other institutions with an alumni constituency of the same size. “Events don’t have a plan,” said one graduate who passionately expresses a “love” for GSU. “We like to claim big numbers and big events, but we don’t pay proper attention to the quality of the events.”

We were pleased to hear countless stories of the impact of numerous recently retired local faculty and staff on the lives of graduates. Perhaps a partial role in alumni relations could be crafted for these individuals in the new organization. (52) In our view, the President should work to invigorate and expand alumni programming. Further, GSU should find ways and means for alumni themselves to pay for a substantial portion of the cost of alumni programs.

Government/Public Relations

There is general consensus on campus that while the perception about Grambling is generally good, public and government relations have suffered from the recent audit and SACS findings. “We’ve had so many Presidents in such a short period of time. Some of these Presidents were people of many and considerable talents, who were well-liked, even revered by many, but just when people would get used to them, we’d meet a new President,” said a state legislator. “Dr. Warner is great at creating a good impression, pressing the flesh, and cultivating. But she is always rushed because of other institutional responsibilities.” As a result, many describe Grambling’s public image as “good, but not well defined” and its legislative presence and clout described as “minimal.” “She’s been a real pro under very difficult circumstances,” commented a member of the staff regarding Dr. Warner and her role in hosting public relations events. Whether the occasion is one to clarify the audit situation, a gala honoring a retiring business leader, or a smaller event relating to its academic or athletic programs, Grambling typically hosts events with appropriate flair.

(53) Even so, the visiting team was surprised at the low profile of the University in “major” media outlets. Other than broad coverage of recent institutional problems and athletics, a six-month review of recent newspaper clippings revealed an unusually low level of substantive news coverage. GSU should develop a more
sophisticated media-relations strategy and target news media in specific cities and markets. Further, more services should be extended to media representatives. Many institutions have found it helpful for public relations officers to meet regularly with representatives of the key media.

(54) It is clear that major changes are required in research, organization, staffing, and programming in the communications area to bring Grambling up to the standards of otherwise comparable universities. Without such changes, the University will be unprepared to move forward, both organizationally and strategically, with an aggressive fund-raising program.

Publications

Institutional publications are also important public relations tools. Based upon “before and after” samples, it is apparent that GSU recently has improved the quality of many of its publications, particularly those going to prospective students. Yet, institutional publications do not exhibit a coordinated approach. Money is spent on a “glossy” and “high color” appearance, but content is sometimes poorly written. The “rich” appearance of the alumni magazine should be replaced with a clean, colorful and efficient tabloid. The absence of a single, clearly identified director of publications has resulted in a lack of appropriate leadership, direction, planning and consistency in the area. This should be addressed through the referenced reorganization. (55) A single person should be responsible for University publications, and that person should be in the public relations area. Publications need “branding” and editing must be upgraded to reflect a higher quality. Perhaps employment of a marketing consultant would be advisable. University publications are also in need of more careful editing.

(56) Grambling also needs a graphic identity that should be included in all publications, letterheads, etc. All publications should be planned, designed, and finally approved for content by a publications officer who reports to the Public Relations Director. This must be enforced.

The following additional recommendations are offered:

(57) Under a tested Vice President for Advancement who is also the Executive Director of the Foundation, the University should employ appropriately credentialed staff in the following capacities: Director of Alumni Affairs, Director of Public Relations; Director of Annual/Corporate Giving; Director of Planned Giving.

(58) It is imperative that the new Vice President has significant experience as a chief advancement officer and he/she must have the authority to entirely restructure all aspects of Grambling’s advancement operation.
(59) The overall support staffing of the institutional advancement office must be given careful scrutiny by the President and Vice President. The office should be monitored carefully with respect to its cost. As a guideline, every dollar spent should generate over time additional revenues of six to eight dollars. Additionally, athletic fund-raising and reporting responsibilities should be transferred to the advancement office along with necessary staff.

(60) All fund raising (alumni, athletic and overall institutional) of the University must fall under the auspices of the Vice President for Advancement. A new Grambling Foundation and Board must be established with 18 to 20 individuals of influence. No more than three Foundation Board members shall be members of the Alumni or Athletic Boards. The Foundation Board shall include individuals with substantive business experience, wealth, influence, and prominence. They should also either be personally capable of supporting Grambling financially or have the contacts to do so. New members of the Foundation Board should include individuals with strong and obvious connections.

(61) The new Foundation Board must take appropriate responsibility for fund-raising. The leadership of the Board should set the tone and a small committee of the strongest members should meet annually to evaluate and rate each member in terms of his/her ability to give. A solicitation amount should be established and Board solicitors should be selected.

(62) In the course of developing the Foundation Board membership, a retreat (led by an outside facilitator) should be scheduled. Among the matters that need to be given attention during the Foundation Board retreat are the following:

a) The structure of the Foundation and policies for operation.
b) The need for additional staff.
c) A proposed Vision Statement for the University—to be prepared and presented by the President and finally approved by the Foundation Board. A vision statement should tell how the institution would accomplish its mission.
d) An analysis of the costs of achieving that Vision, with a time-line.
e) An analysis of the endowment and fund-raising requirements for achieving the vision on an annual and long-term basis.
f) A determination of the role the Foundation Board members should play in raising the necessary funding.
g) An analysis of the Foundation Board’s abilities to assume that role and raise those monies.
h) The establishment of a statement of principles defining the precise expectations of all Foundation Board members, including and emphasizing fund raising.
There is general consensus in the region that the President must be an individual whose political acumen will provide the University with the knowledge, energy, and strategic thinking it needs and will result in improvements in public and governmental relations. Recent political/governmental/public relations activities, however, much like fundraising activities, appear to have been counterproductive, replicative, or off-base. The President and the Vice President for Advancement must share and effectively communicate an exciting vision for the institution.

“There simply is no substitute for a president with a passion for her/his university. That President needs to be seen and heard, but especially has to get out and meet the people who make things happen,” asserted a state official. A President would be well advised to heed this advice, for it is one of the keys to each institution’s future. In addition to legislators, the permanent President should plan and conduct an early blitz of alumni chapters and other groupings of alumni around the region and beyond.

All fund-raising functions (GUNAA, GAF, etc.) should be coordinated by the new Grambling State University Foundation. There does not exist a good rationale for having separate foundations in this day and age. Modern bookkeeping and computerization of records enable a single foundation to distribute the funds it receives into separate accounts for various organizations; this would not be a difficult thing to do in this case. Many donors report receiving multiple solicitations each year. This can be corrected by centralization of alumni and other donor names and giving records.

The success of athletics at Grambling has made their fundraising efforts the envy of the campus. We recommend that the President commission a study group to examine the ways and means by which fiscal integrity can be maintained relative to the program.

Primarily due to its rich history, the University has become skilled at planning and orchestrating major events. Yet, because of the adverse recent circumstances, we cannot assess whether the cost of these events justified the expenditures made upon them and therefore believe that attention should be given to this in the proposed new design.

To the extent possible, the public relations focus should move away from explaining problems and concentrate on aspirations and how they will be achieved.

Establish a Public Relations Council utilizing “experts” from important media.

Utilizing the Internet, initiate a weekly campus newsletter to faculty/staff, alumni, friends, legislature and prospective students. For the most part, readers will not come to a web-site looking for news. This information can be disseminated via e-mail.
(71) Conduct a content analysis of materials on the University’s web site. The current site lacks graphic appeal and needs to be easier to navigate.
X. GOVERNANCE

Basic Premises for University Governance

Although a university is a corporation, it is unlike a business and unique because of two conditions that have come to be considered fundamental: academic freedom and shared governance. There are two primary documents that most accept as standards against which the condition of a university is measured: The 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure and The Joint 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities. Except in extreme cases, both faculty and administration consider these documents as essential roots for university governance.

Although some believe it is not possible to conduct an effective presidency under these premises, quite the contrary is true. The problem in many institutions has not been the concepts of academic freedom or shared governance; rather, institutions often become stalled and in conflict - - in effect, leaderless because they become mired in their own faulty governance designs, ostensibly forged to protect or achieve these conditions. The unfortunate result has been that many boards and some faculty and administrators have come to question the concepts themselves. Yet, neither concept is at all frightening or demanding; to paraphrase: “the fault is not in our stars, but in ourselves....”

Campus Governance

At first glance, the campus governance system at GSU looks impressive. There is a Faculty Senate elected by the faculty which includes ex officio non-voting members of the student body and the administration. There are six standing committees that bode both efficiency and action. Indeed, we have rarely seen a set of institutional bylaws more consistent with both the 1966 AAUP Statement on Shared Governance and individual accountability.

There are three exceptions to the above:

The first: while the administration is obligated to inform the Senate in writing within three weeks following the submission of a recommendation (Article II, Section 3.B.), the administration is not bound to inform the Board of Supervisors. (72) This should be revised to read to this effect, “If any recommendation of the Faculty Senate is not acceptable to the administration, the Senate and the Board of Supervisors shall be notified....”

The second concerns administrative participation: while the administration is non-voting, ex officio, there are so many that their presence can literally swamp the elected representatives of the faculty (Article III, Section 3.A.). (73) It is recommended that the President, the deans and the department heads be eliminated from Senate membership; such action would leave the Vice Presidents, who ultimately are responsible for the performance of all other administrators, and would enable the President to gain valuable perspective on all important campus decisions.

(74) The Senate Committee system itself is generally logical and potentially effective, but the permanent President may want to review the system so that it more nearly matches the committees of the Board of Supervisors.
The third, and most dramatic, is the existence of twenty nine standing committees, enough to warrant that any system would be ineffective. Little wonder that faculty report that the Senate “is not respected” when it is bound in a maze of overlapping University committees reporting directly to the administration. This structure represents wheel spinning extraordinaire.

Assuming these changes, or a reasonable facsimile, (75) the responsibilities of the present large number of University committees should be assigned to an existing Senate committee thereby creating a much more efficient and workable system that would meaningfully and intelligently engage the faculty in the decision making process.

Finally, (76) it is recommended that the President appoint an ad hoc task force to consider campus governance with a thoughtful eye toward the recommendations in this Review.

The Board of Supervisors

GSU is governed by the Board of Supervisors for the University of Louisiana System. The President of the System is Dr. Sally Clausen who is universally admired and viewed as both understanding and supportive of GSU.

Until recently, many at GSU had serious reservations about the Board of Supervisors. That Grambling has had five Presidents and seven chief financial officers in the past twelve years is viewed as the direct responsibility of the Board. Members of the GSU community appear to hold the Board responsible for “destabilizing the University, demoralizing the faculty and weakening both the influence and image of the University.” They believe that the process of presidential selection has been so “politicized” that unsatisfactory results are bound to maintain. Further, the oral tradition at Grambling is that a series of middle and lower level administrators, a variety of staff employees, and even some faculty were “forced upon the University” by inappropriate Supervisor and legislative influence.

With the coming of Dr. Clausen, leaders in the GSU community believe that there is a “serious commitment” to reform the process and restore the integrity of the Presidency and the University. She is universally seen as a “driving force for reform and hope,” both on- and off-campus. Additionally, the Board of Supervisors is now viewed as committed to the repair and resurrection of the University.

This impression is echoed off-campus. Fortunately, a “new day has dawned at Grambling,” according to a media observer. “It’s now more important what you know than who you know,” argues a faculty member. (77) We applaud the current Board’s concern for Grambling and its determination to avoid inappropriate interference in the institution’s affairs, even while it properly insists upon extensive monitoring and evaluating of the institution. The University must be responsible for its own affairs, but its operations and activities must be subjected to intense scrutiny, especially in the financial arena.
The Board must now appoint an outstanding permanent President who will be responsible for, and fulfill, the University’s mission without inappropriate interference from the Board, legislature or Governor’s office. For example, the Board should examine and approve the next President’s choices for his/her executive cabinet, but should not substitute its own preferences (or those of external political figures) for the President’s considered judgment. On the other hand, it should be insistent that Grambling satisfy all appropriate financial standards and hold responsible the next President and his/her staff for such. The bottom line is this---the Board and others must give the next President authority and must not inappropriately interfere in his/her administration. By the same token, the Board and the System President must require complete accountability from the President of GSU.

There is widespread appreciation for the necessity of appointing, indeed recruiting, a strong, tested, effective leader as the permanent President of GSU. There is a general appreciation of the need to create the conditions necessary to attract such a person.
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James L. Fisher
Review Team Chair
Brief Biography

James L. Fisher is the most published writer on leadership and organization in higher education today. He has written scores of professional articles and has also been published in such popular media as The New York Times, The Washington Times, and The Baltimore Sun. The author or editor of nine books, his book, The Board and the President, "clearly established him as the nation's leading authority on the college presidency," wrote Michael Worth of George Washington University reviewing in Currents. His The Power of the Presidency was reviewed in Change magazine as "the most important book ever written on the college presidency" and was nominated for the non-fiction Pulitzer Prize. His recent book, Presidential Leadership: Making a Difference, has been reviewed as "...a virtual Dr. Spock for aspiring or new college presidents, and ...a must read for all trustees." His newest book, Positive Power, is quickly gaining popularity throughout the United States and internationally:

“The modern Machiavelli...from Aegon to Zenix...persuasive and to the point,”
Baltimore Sun.

“There is definitely something happening with this book. We are out of stock already,”
National Book Network

His next book, The Entrepreneurial President, is scheduled for publication in 2003.

A registered psychologist with a Ph.D. from Northwestern University, he is President Emeritus of the Council for Advancement & Support of Education (CASE) and President Emeritus of Towson University. He is presently Professor of Leadership Studies at The Union Institute and University and a consultant to boards and presidents. He has taught at Northwestern, Illinois State, Johns Hopkins, Harvard, and the University of Georgia. He has worked with more than three hundred colleges and universities including Alabama A&M University, Fayetteville State University, Fisk University, Florida Memorial College, Morgan State University, Norfolk State University, Virginia State University and as a speaker for NAFEO and the United Negro College Fund. He coined the term institutional review and has conducted hundreds for private and public institutions. He also conducts board orientations and consults on presidential searches, evaluations and contracts.

Dr. Fisher has been a trustee at eleven private colleges and universities and two preparatory schools. A former Marine, he presently serves as a trustee of the Marine Military Academy, Millikin University, and Florida Institute of Technology. He has received awards for teaching, writing, citizenship and leadership and has been awarded twelve honorary degrees. At Illinois State, The Outstanding Thesis Award was named by the faculty The James L. Fisher Thesis Award. The faculty at Towson University recommended that the new psychology building be named after Dr. Fisher, and the CASE Distinguished Service to Education Award bears his name.

While president at Towson, his government relations activities were sufficient to overturn gubernatorial vetoes. The Baltimore Sun wrote that he was a "master educational politician....under his leadership, enrollment doubled, quality went up and costs went down." In Washington, Newsweek magazine reported that, while President at CASE, his national campaign, The Action Committee for Higher Education (ACHE) resulted in "more than $1 billion in student financial aid." CASE also created and orchestrated the "America's Energy is Mindpower" campaign, "Higher Education Week" and "The Professor of the Year" awards. For several years, he did a popular daily radio commentary on WBAL in Baltimore and has been an occasional OP/ED feature writer for The Baltimore Sun. Through the years, Dr. Fisher has been encouraged by leaders in both parties to run for Governor or Senate.
When then Glassboro State College Board of Trustees selected Dr. Herman D. James to be the college’s fifth president in 1984, they saw in him a person of vision; a man whom they felt could also translate that vision into action.

Under his leadership, in July 1992 the college received the largest gift ever bestowed on a public institution of higher education: a $100 million gift from industrialists Henry M. and Betty Rowan. The gift fueled Dr. James’ vision to bring the college, now named in honor of its benefactors, to a position of leadership in southern New Jersey and throughout the state. He oversaw the development of a state-of-the-art College of Engineering and the initiation of the region’s first Doctoral Program. The author of Beyond 2000: The Rowan Vision, Dr. James was the force behind the vision for Rowan University becoming a high-value regional resource.

Since his appointment as president, more and more students are applying to Rowan for their education. The academic quality of the student body was significantly increased, with average SAT scores for incoming freshman rising dramatically by over 200 points during the last 10 years. At the same time, the diversity of the students was also increased.

Dr. James’ personal and professional life reflects the same commitment to the pursuit of excellence. Born in the Virgin Islands and raised in Harlem, Dr. James attended Tuskegee University in Alabama, where he received a B.S. degree in education. He earned his M.A. in sociology at St. John’s University in New York, and his Ph.D. in the same field from the University of Pittsburgh.

Dr. James taught at the University of Pittsburgh and then at the University of Massachusetts in Boston, where he was appointed associate provost in 1975 and, later, assistant chancellor. In 1978, he became vice provost and professor of sociology at the California State University at Northridge. In 1982, he came to Rowan a vice president for academic affairs.

Dr. James is recognized as a national and regional leader in higher education. He has served on the governmental commission of the American Council on Education and on the Board of Directors of the Council for Aid to Education and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. He was vice chairman of the N.J. Presidents’ Council of N.J. Colleges and Universities. He was a member of the Board of Directors of the N.J. State Chamber of Commerce and the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, and was an honorary trustee of the N.J. Symphony Orchestra. He currently serves on the Board of Directors of South Jersey Industries.

Dr. James served on the transition team for Governor-elect James Florio in 1989. He also served on the higher education advisory group for Governor-elect Christine Whitman in 1994.

He is the recipient of the Boston Metropolitan YMCA Outstanding Black Achiever Award, the Tuskegee Institute Alumni Testimonial and the Humanitarian Award of the Prince Hall Masons. In 1994, he received the Eileen Tosney Award from the American Association of the University Administrators as the outstanding university administrator for the year. In 1996 he received an Honorary Doctor of Laws degree from Tuskegee University. In 1998, he received an honorary Doctors of Education from Bridgewater State University in Massachusetts.

Dr. James currently occupies the position of Distinguished Professor at Rowan University. He teaches and provides research leadership in two academic departments.
James V. Koch
Brief Biography

James V. Koch is Board of Visitors Professor of Economics and President Emeritus at Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA. Dr. Koch served as President of Old Dominion 1990-2001. Prior to that, he was President of the University of Montana, 1986-1990. An Exxon Foundation study of American college presidents selected him as one of the 100 most effective college presidents in the United States. During his tenure at Old Dominion, the University recorded its first Rhodes Scholar, developed the largest televised, interactive distance learning system in the United States, and initiated more than $300 million in new construction.

Dr. Koch is an economist who has published seven books and 70 refereed journal articles in the field. His *Industrial Organization and Prices* was the leading text in this specialty for several years. The focus of his current research is the economics of e-commerce. He has taught at institutions ranging from Illinois State University to Brown University, the University of Hawaii, and the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology. His *Presidential Leadership: Making a Difference*, co-authored with James L. Fisher, is regarded as the definitive work concerning college presidents and their boards. He has been individually or collectively involved in the assessment of more than 30 presidents and institutions of higher education.

Dr. Koch earned a B.A. degree from Illinois State University and his Ph.D. degree in Economics from Northwestern University. He has received three honorary doctoral degrees from universities in Japan and Korea and has received a host of honors from organizations such as the Urban League, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and several regional economic development agencies.
Scott D. Miller
Brief Biography

Scott D. Miller, 43, became President and DuPont Professor of Leadership Studies at Wesley College in 1997. Dr. Miller has directed the most extensive restructuring process in the institution’s 130-year history.

He has procured over $30 million in capital improvement funds for technology, science instrumentation, campus physical plant upgrade and renovations, expansion of the library and student recreation facilities, and deferred maintenance. Nearly $47 million has been raised during the past five years, earning the College accolades from the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education Circle of Excellence Awards for Overall Fund-raising Improvement and Overall Fund-raising Performance. (He has raised over $110 million during his 21 years in higher education.) He has earned numerous national accolades for his work at Wesley and is featured in a new book entitled The Small College Guide to Financial Health (by Michael Townsley, NACUBO: Washington, D.C., 2002) and also Business Officer magazine (September, 2002: NACUBO) as one of two “amazing turnaround” case studies.

Wesley’s enrollment has grown from 1,052 to 2,250; residential enrollment increased by 120 percent; and full-time students more than doubled. The curriculum has been expanded to include four graduate programs, a Center for Adult Studies, and three new intercollegiate sports have been added. In 1998, he was a co-founder of the first publicly funded charter school on a private college campus in the United States—a school that enrolls 547 students in grades 1-12. He has created distance learning partnerships involving West Virginia Wesleyan College, Eastern University, and Wesley Seminary. He is a co-founder of the Interamerican Consortium, an international collaborative of five American colleges and eight foreign institutions. When coupled with programs in The Wesley Collegiate Institute (pre-collegiate programs), total institutional enrollment has grown from 1,052 to 3,850 during Dr. Miller’s five years of service.

Prior to coming to Wesley, Dr. Miller served as the 16th president of Lincoln Memorial University (1991-97). He had been an administrator at LMU since 1984, having served as vice president for development and executive vice president before being named to the top post in 1991. He also held academic rank as Professor of Leadership Studies and is President-Emeritus at LMU.

Dr. Miller earned his B.A. from West Virginia Wesleyan College, M.A. from the University of Dayton, Ed.S. from Vanderbilt University, and Ph.D. in higher education administration from The Union Institute & University. His doctoral dissertation, funded by Pew Charitable Trusts, was a landmark study on Appalachian institutional advancement. He has also completed post-graduate studies at Ohio University and Harvard University.
Eddie N. Moore, Jr.

Brief Biography

Eddie N. Moore, Jr. assumed his position as the 12th president of Virginia State University on June 1, 1993. In 1971, Moore began his career in the private sector at the Gulf Oil Corporation. During his 14-year tenure with Gulf Oil, he rose through the ranks, and eventually began directing major components of the corporation's accounting and budgeting functions. He entered the public sector in 1985 as the Assistant Comptroller for Accounting and Reporting for the Commonwealth of Virginia. In 1988, he was selected to serve concurrently as both the University Comptroller for the College of William and Mary, and as the Treasurer of its Endowment Association. In 1990, Mr. Moore became the head of the Department of the Treasurer under Governor Lawrence Douglas Wilder. As the State Treasurer, he served as the head of the Department of the Treasury; he also served on 15 state boards and authorities that had oversight authority for over $20 billion of the Commonwealth's assets.

Within the realm of academic management, President Moore has been very active. Committed to enhancing the quality of education and the availability of opportunities for college students, he serves on the Virginia Board of Agriculture and the Education Subcommittee of Richmond Renaissance. Also, he serves as a Board member and Chair of the Finance Committee of the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association (CIAA), has more recently been re-appointed to the Board of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), is Vice-Chair/Treasurer of the 1890 Council of Presidents and Board Member of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), serves on the Vantagepoint Funds Board, is a member of the Board of the Universal Corporation, Inc., is a Virginia Historical Society Board Member, and more recently he has been appointed to serve as a board member of the Virginia Center for Innovative Technology.

A native of Philadelphia, President Moore holds a Bachelor of Science degree in accounting from Pennsylvania State University and a Master of Business Administration degree from the University of Pittsburgh. He is a certified public accountant in both Texas and Virginia. A Vietnam War Veteran, Moore served as an officer and received many honors. Also, he has earned several awards, including the 1995 Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Legacy Award in the area of Education, and he holds an Honorary Doctor of Letters degree, for leadership in public service, from Virginia State University. In 1999, he became the recipient of the Distinguished Alumnus Award from the Pennsylvania State University, received the Thurgood Marshall Scholarship Fund=U.S Leadership Award in October 2000 and in May 2001 he was the recipient of the Katz School of Business Alumni Award from the University of Pittsburgh. In addition to his academic affiliations, President Moore is an active member of St. James Baptist Church in Richmond, Virginia. He is married to Elisia Almendarez Moore and has five children and two grandchildren.
Dr. George A. Pruitt
Brief Biography

Dr. George A. Pruitt has been President of Thomas Edison State College since 1982.

Prior to coming to the College, he served in executive leadership positions at Illinois State University, Towson State University, Morgan State University, Tennessee State University, and the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL). He is active in the formulation of educational policy nationally and within the State of New Jersey.

He has served as Chairman of the Council of New Jersey State College Presidents; Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning; member of three national commissions of the American Council on Education; Chairman of the Committee on Alternatives and Innovation of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities; and Advisor to the Kellogg National Fellowship Program of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. Dr. Pruitt is currently Past Chairman of the Mercer County Chamber of Commerce, Trenton, New Jersey; a member of the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity, United States Department of Education. He sits on the Board of Directors of Sun National Bank; Rider University; Structured Employment Economic Development Corporation (SEEDCO), New York; and The Union Institute, Cincinnati, Ohio.

He has consulted widely in business and government, as well as within the higher education community. He has served in an advisory capacity to three Secretaries of Education under two Presidents of both parties. He is the recipient of three honorary degrees in addition to numerous awards, honors, and commendations. In a study of presidential leadership funded by the Exxon Education Foundation, Dr. Pruitt was identified as one of the most effective college presidents in the United States.
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INTERVIEWEES:

Encarna Abella, Faculty
Nasir U. Ahmed, Faculty
Pia Alburquerque, Faculty
Dorothy Alexander, Dean, College of Basic & Special Studies
Miranda Anderson, Student
Claudine Ashton, Faculty
Johnetta Askew, Student
Blasius Awonsang, Student
Curtis Baham, Vice President, Academic Affairs
Monica Bailey, EEO officer
Rackquell Baker, Student
Mary L. Balthazar, Faculty
Wilton Barham, Faculty
Mark Blake, Facilities Management
Zinnia Blake, Faculty
Christopher Bland, Student
James Bradford, President, Grambling University National Alumni Association
Alvin Bradley, Director, Purchasing
Connie Breaux, Director, United Campus Ministry
Dianna L. Brown, Faculty
Lee Brown, Student
Vickie Brown, Principal, Faculty Laboratory School
Shawn Bruno, External Auditor
Elsie Burkhalter, Chair, Academic & Student Affairs
Carl Butler, Student
Donells Cann, Student
Sally Carroll, Serials Librarian
Sally Clausen, President, University of Louisiana System
D.J. Clay, Student
Floyd Coleman, Faculty
Ruby Coleman, Director, Child Care Center
Carolyn D. Collier, Outreach Programs
Tonnisha Connally, Student
Jacqueline Cooper, Student
James Cooper, KRUS
Birdex Copeland, local government official
Joe Copes, Title III Programs Director
Tenisha Cousby, Student
Byron Coward, Student
Leicy Crawford, Student
Nettie Daniels, Assistant Vice President for Research, University of Louisiana System
LeDretric Davis, Student
Barry Delcambre, Vice President, Enrollment Management
Al Dennis, Athletic Director
Sarah Dennis, Faculty
Waneene Dorsey, Faculty
Adonis Ducre, SGA President
Stacey Duhon, Faculty
Joyce Dunn, Editor, *Gamblinite*
Colandra Paige Dupree, Miss GSU
Mark Edmonson, Student
Karen Emmanuel, Associate Vice President, Human Resources
Bobbie Ethridge, Student Affairs
Marianne Fisher-Giorlando, Faculty
Berthina Fomenby, Student
Stephen Fontenot, Director, Favrot Student Union/Activities
Elaine Foster, Faculty
Rick Gallot, State Legislature
Cedric Glover, State Legislature
Konwre Gordon, Student
Ebony Gray, Student
Lottie Green, Alumna
Ramona Green, Director, Foster-Johnson Health Center
Jacklen Greer, Graduate Studies
Joyce A. Guy, Director, Residential Life
Moses Gwan, Faculty
Brandie Hall, Student
Alexia Hamonds, Student
Andolyn Harrison, Dean, College of Education
Chad A. Harry, Student
Robert Hashway, Faculty
Mignon Head, Student
Ruby Higgins, Vice President, Student Affairs
D.C. Hoard, Director, Housing
Don Hoyt, Faculty
Danny Hubbard, Faculty
Jackie Huey, Faculty
Glenda Island, Research/Development
Vickie Jackson, Director, Public Relations
Loretta Jaggers, Faculty
Daniel Johnson, Faculty
Ernest Johnson, Community leader
Betty Jones, Facilities Management
Bill Jones, Senator, elected official
Hazel Jones, Professor Emeritus
Evelyn Sheppard Winn, Faculty
Mike Woods, Board member
David Wright, Board member
Nineteen Department Chairs in a meal meeting
Twenty-three Additional Faculty and Students in meal meetings
Forty-three Anonymous Students, Staff, Faculty and Townspeople
We have been asked to review the condition of the Grambling University. Please respond in terms of your impression of the following. Your answers will be kept in confidence.

1. GENERAL CONDITION OF THE UNIVERSITY (STRENGTHS, LIMITATIONS)
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________

2. ACADEMIC PROGRAMS
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________

3. TECHNOLOGY
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________

4. FACULTY (QUALITY, MORALE, WORKLOAD, COMPENSATION, ET AL)
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________

5. STUDENTS (CREDENTIALS, MORALE, AWARENESS, RACIAL, NATIONAL, FINANCIAL AID, ET AL)
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________

6. ADMINISTRATION
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________

7. SENIOR OFFICERS
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________

8. BUDGET AND FINANCE (EMPHASIZE THIS.)
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
9. FUND-RAISING AND DEVELOPMENT

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

10. PUBLIC AND GOVERNMENT RELATIONS

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

11. ALUMNI AFFAIRS

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

12. INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

13. CAMPUS GOVERNANCE

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

14. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND SYSTEM OFFICERS

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

15. COMPARATIVE CONDITION OF THE UNIVERSITY, DOCUMENTATION IF ANY

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

16. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________
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Materials Used in the Review:

“Fisher Template”

The Operating Fund Budget, 2002-2003

Financial Statements

Alumni Association Audit, FY ended 12/31/01

Centennial Campaign Fund

Tiger Annual Fund

Grambling Athletic Foundation Bylaws

Grambling University National Alumni Association Constitution & Bylaws

Consent Decree for several academic programs

Self-Study Report - Masters of Social Work Program (MSW) Volume 1, 1/21/99

Practitioner Teacher Program - March 2002


AACSB Self-Evaluation Report, Volume II

Questionnaire for Review of Drafting Design Technology Program, Volume II, June 2002

Baccalaureate Level Teacher Preparation Programs

Supplemental Report, October 7, 2002

Self-Study Report - Bachelor of Science in Nursing Program


Self-study Report - Department of Mass Communication, College of Liberal Arts, Grambling State University, for the purpose of Reaccreditations by ACEJMC, 1998


Baccalaureate Program, Supporting Documents, Apr 1, 2002

Strategic Plan FY 2001-2002 through 2005-2006

2001-2003 Student Handbook

Louisiana State Board of Nursing Summary of Report of site visit to Grambling State University, Nov 3-4, 1999

Self-study Report, Bachelor of Science in Nursing Program, Spring 1996

Institutional Self-study, Dec 1999
Supplemental Information for Engineering Technology Programs at Grambling State University, Sept 2002

Questionnaire for Review of Engineering Technology Program, Volume I, Jun 2002

Questionnaire for Review of Electronics Engineering Technology Programs, Volume II, June 2002

Faculty Handbook, Aug 2002

Self-study Report, Master of Science in Nursing Program, Spring 2002

Self-study Report, The Department of Music

Class Size Evaluations Folder of Data

*The Gramblinite*

*Visions* magazine (5 years)

Miscellaneous information gathered by the Grambling State University President’s office to include but not limited to: Undergraduate and Graduate catalogs and brochures, policy manuals, institutional promotional pieces, media coverage, speeches by the President, line staff charts, Board and campus governance Bylaws, minutes of the Board and Executive Committee meetings, et al.