Institutional Task Force on Diversity
Final Report
October 2009

I. Background

In July of 2008, Fr. Robert Niehoff, S.J., president of John Carroll University, communicated to the university community that he was establishing an Institutional Task Force on Diversity. In that message, the charge of the task force was articulated as follows:

> This group will represent the entire institution and will convene when the 2008-2009 academic year begins. This is an ideal time to ask such a group to advance the efforts of so many across campus as we seek to make our campus more inclusive.

> Numerous groups and initiatives have developed in the recent past all of which are committed to strengthening the working and learning environment in ways that are cognizant of aspects of diversity including the Faculty of Color Organization, the Women's Faculty Caucus, the Student Diversity Initiative Task Force, and the Faculty Council Committee on Gender and Diversity. This commitment to diversity, inclusion and multiculturalism is described in the February 2008 presidential memo as well as the Vision, Mission, Core Values, and Strategic Initiatives Statement. The task force will make recommendations to me on ways the university can best coordinate the commitment to diversity, inclusion, and multiculturalism.

> The task force will gather information about current university efforts related to diversity with the goal of identifying areas of strength, areas for improvement and ways to minimize duplication of effort. Based on the information gathered, they will make recommendations to the President by May of 2009. These recommendations may include:

> - How to foster a culture for a community of inclusion;
> - Steps to improve the experience of students, faculty, staff and administrators (particularly those from historically underrepresented populations);
> - An institutional structure that would serve the strategic implementation of a diversity agenda in order to institutionalize the commitment to diversity;
> - And any other recommendations resulting from their fact-finding initiatives.

The members of the Task Force met monthly from September 2008 until May 2009. While the task force's work was both goal and task oriented, considerable energy was spent in initial meetings sharing perspectives and experiences from our various institutional vantage points. The premise underlying this expenditure of time and energy reflects the current thinking within the higher education community about how best to advance a commitment to inclusion and cultural competence. Understanding our own perspectives and learning more about the experiences of others on the committee helped to foster a climate of trust as well as develop a shared vision. The committee started from the premise that a commitment to meaningful diversity and inclusion requires engagement and support from **all** members of the community; that our task was not merely to develop recommendations that others would be asked to execute and implement but rather our responsibility was to articulate what an institutional commitment to inclusion

would entail and how each member of the community might develop the capacity to contribute and support that goal. Admittedly, the committee struggled with this task as most of us are accustomed to traditional committees who often analyze data and delegate tasks such that recommendations are made that others can and should implement. While it is certainly appropriate and necessary in this work to think in terms of systems and structures and which offices are best equipped to effect change, the Task Force would also like to challenge ourselves and the broader university community to infuse the dynamism of grass-roots activism and individual level responsibility into subsequent discussions of diversity, inclusion and cultural competence.

We began our work by identifying effective institutional practices, programs and offices that illustrate the level of our institutional commitment with which we were familiar. The goal of the exercise was to remind us that there were strengths upon which we could and should draw. While not exhaustive, these include curricular tracks within departments, experiential learning opportunities, the Shirley Seaton Cultural Awareness Series, the Ohio Access Initiative, the myriad Student Affairs initiatives, and the rise of faculty affinity groups such as the Faculty of Color Organization (FOCO), the Faculty Women's Caucus and the Council Committee on Gender and Diversity. This exercise also allowed us to identify gaps in programs, structures, shared assumptions and vision. Too often diversity was understood solely in terms of race and ethnicity. Too often people of color were assumed to be disadvantaged and lacking rather than seen as underrepresented. Assimilation into existing norms and structures may too often still be the implicit assumption. Efforts to effect change, while all well intentioned, have often been piecemeal with a "band-aid" approach rather than providing a more systemic and comprehensive undertaking. We understood that better coordinating the considerable programmatic efforts was the essence of our charge. And we quickly came to the realization that while the myriad efforts were laudable, they were not sufficiently penetrating the institutional culture. Many on the task force described the status quo as approaching crisis level especially when considering the experiences of people of color and those from the LGBT community. We perceived a sense of urgency in trying to alter the campus climate and culture and saw as our primary objective identifying mechanisms that would challenge members of majority groups to become more culturally competent, inclusive and authentically committed to diversity.

In short, task force members perceive a commitment to inclusion as remaining on the margins. While most of us including those in senior leadership positions are committed to it, fostering this commitment in a demonstrable way is not understood or operationalized as being central to our vitality. Rather, it is often viewed as an acceptable addition but only when we have time and money.

Additionally and perhaps in relation to the previous discussion, our work together has reinforced our perception that a significant obstacle to change on the JCU campus remains the highly decentralized character of the campus. Concomitant with that is the simultaneous reticence by many, especially those in the "middle" of the organizational chart, to assume responsibility for change (since decentralization implies a diffuse decision-making structure). At the same time, in our work and in other conversations throughout the university, there is the stated desire for "leadership and direction." We hope this report helps provide the impetus for that leadership and direction to be provided by appropriate people and offices.

So as we proceed with analysis and recommendations in this report, we appreciate that articulating a list of action steps to be assigned to existing offices and departments may

not effect meaningful change until all or most of us are wiling to embrace and accept a commitment to creating, nurturing and sustaining a diverse, inclusive and culturally competent environment.

This report, then, is a call to action for the JCU community. As a Jesuit Catholic university committed to rigorous inquiry, liberal education and social justice, there is an enormous opportunity to draw on those three commitments that make manifest and real our core value of creating "an inclusive community where differing points of view and experience are valued as opportunities for mutual learning" and to advance the strategic initiatives to "create a diverse community of faculty, staff, alumni and friends" and "recruit, enroll, retain and graduate a talented, diverse student body prepared for today's global reality and committed to learning, leadership and service that will engage the world." Fundamental changes in our culture and our structures are necessary to honor and make tangible and real this value. We need to organize our offices and structures, our curriculum and our co-curriculum in ways that will address the climate and culture challenges that are most urgent. In so doing, we can then attend to enhancing the access and equity efforts in place at the institution.

II. Assumptions/Premises

These conversations and meetings allowed us to develop a shared set of assumptions as we moved toward recommendations designed to strengthen JCU's commitment to diversity and inclusion and to improve the experience of those on our campus from historically underrepresented groups. These assumptions and premises include the following:

1. Our commitment to inclusion and cultural competence needs to be integral and central to the university. Too often institutional commitments to diversity are viewed as worthwhile additions rather than a call to re-organize how and why education is delivered. While numerous and significant strides have been made in recent years (and will be referenced throughout this report) at JCU, much more needs to be done. We are poised to move from nurturing various grassroots initiatives that are programmatic in nature to sustaining a more comprehensive and systemic commitment to diversity, inclusion and cultural competence**.**

2. We understand, recognize and appreciate the distinction between a commitment to **diversity** -- a term that includes issues related to culture, class, race, sexual orientation, gender, religion and body-ability and **inclusion** – defined as the active, intentional, and ongoing engagement with diversity—in people, in the curriculum, in the co-curriculum, and in communities (intellectual, social, cultural, geographical) with which individuals might connect—in ways that increase one's awareness, content knowledge, cognitive sophistication, and empathic understanding of the complex ways individuals interact within systems and institutions. We think our goal should be to support inclusion and diversity efforts such that each of us demonstrates **cultural competence**, or an ability to interact effectively with people of different cultures.

   We start from the premise that structural or representational diversity DOES NOT necessarily result in an inclusive environment or an environment respectful of diversity without being explicitly attentive to fostering a climate where all feel welcome, included and valued.

Further, we need to understand the positive characteristics created and enhanced by a diverse and inclusive community. These characteristics or perspectives have positive **outcomes** at both the personal and communal level on various dimensions including intellectual (critical thinking and problem solving), social (the ability to work with others who hold different views, a facility with challenging stereotypes/preconceptions and the promotion of personal growth vis-à-vis one's environment), ethical (following an ethical injunction to respect others regardless of their difference and fostering a commitment to social justice), moral (specifically grounded in the Ignatian tradition of "seeing God in all things"), and pragmatic (training ourselves and others to compete in a global market).

And while we already value these outcomes and many members of our community attain them, strengthening our commitment to diversity, inclusion and cultural competence would ensure that a critical mass of students, faculty and staff and administrators would achieve these outcomes in a more robust way.

3. The American Association of Colleges &Universities (hereafter AAC&U) model of inclusive excellence should provide our organizing framework for advancing our commitment to diversity and inclusion given its emphasis on both *quality* and *diversity.* As the reports of AAC&U make clear, an authentic commitment to diversity means an integration of diversity and quality efforts. This work needs to be situated at the core of institutional functioning and must realize the educational benefits available to students and to the institution when this integration is done well and is sustained over time (Clayton-Pederson and Musil, p.iii). The mode of inclusive excellence can best be summarized as follows:

- A focus on student intellectual and social development. Academically, it means offering the best possible course of study for the context in which the education is offered.

- A purposeful development and utilization of organizational resources to enhance student learning. Organizationally, it means establishing an environment that challenges each student to achieve academically at high levels and each member of the campus to contribute to learning and knowledge development.

- Attention to the cultural differences learners bring to the educational experience and that enhance the enterprise.

- A welcoming community that engages all of its diversity in the service of student and organizational learning.

- The Model of Inclusive Excellence includes four dimensions: Access and Equity, Culture and Climate, Curriculum, and Learning/Development. This report will be organized in terms of these dimensions and will detail recommendations that are articulated as goals and strategies that can upon implementation give rise to measurable objectives.

4. The Jesuit and Catholic character of the institution provides a useful framework within which to analyze the various facets of inclusion, diversity and cultural competence. While in principle Ignatian values call us to foster inclusion and diversity, the religious character of the institution has too often allowed some community members to experience exclusion, including those from faith traditions that are not Roman Catholic and those who perceive Church teachings to be hostile to their identities. We knew it was important to acknowledge the ways in which the religious character of the institution has limited progress on diversity and inclusion without accepting that as inevitable at a Catholic institution. Instead, the religious character of John Carroll should have the power to compel a commitment to justice that nurtures a climate of inclusion.

5. Of these dimensions, we start from the premise that culture and climate are the most pressing issues requiring attention and response on the JCU campus – but attending to access and equity, curriculum, learning and development will also strengthen culture and climate. To do this, we must structure and organize ourselves in a way that will require and demand meaningful changes in our culture and climate.

6. We acknowledge lots of educational innovations and impressive initiatives as they relate to diversity and inclusion on the JCU campus but we perceive a need to articulate the structures that link them. A major goal of this report/set of recommendations is to "create synergy within and across organizational systems through the alignment of structures, policies, curricular frameworks, faculty development policies, resources, symbols and cultures" (Williams, Berger and McClendon, p.3).

In short and as suggested above, the work of the Institutional Task Force on Diversity seeks to support the university's core value of creating "an inclusive community where differing points of view and experience are valued as opportunities for mutual learning" and to advance the strategic initiatives to "create a diverse community of faculty, staff, alumni and friends" and "recruit, enroll, retain and graduate a talented, diverse student body prepared for today's global reality and committed to learning, leadership and service that will engage the world."

We offer these goals and strategies mindful that for meaningful change to occur, the emphasis must be on "collegial and democratic decision-making rather than administrative fiat" (Williams, Berger and McLendon, p.15) but we think these structural and organizational changes will facilitate better vehicles through which to share information and make decisions.

III. Structure and Organization

The impetus for the creation of this task force was the realization that many worthwhile initiatives were being undertaken across campus. These include the programming of the Student Diversity Initiatives Working Group, the emergence of faculty affinity groups such as the Faculty of Color Organization (FOCO), the Faculty Women's Caucus, the Council Committee on Gender and Diversity, the creation of the Office of Faculty Diversity, the attention given these issues by the Office of Legal Counsel, the work of the Office of Access and Retention, and the longstanding efforts of the Office of Multicultural Affairs. To sustain and institutionalize the efforts requires a more coordinated effort and requires

that implementation of diversity and inclusion initiatives be seen as the responsibility of everyone. As noted above, JCU culture and organization is characterized by a commitment to decentralization. For inclusion and diversity to become central to our work and mission (and our Jesuit Catholic character suggests it must be central and not peripheral), then we have to organize the institution in ways that centralize our efforts.

GOAL 1: Make central our commitment to diversity, inclusion and cultural competence

Strategy 1:1 Create a diversity (or inclusive excellence) steering committee that could:
- Set institutional goals
- Measure progress toward attaining those goals
- Hold offices and people accountable to ensure progress
- Examine models to create an Office of Diversity and Inclusion

Ideally, John Carroll would have a Chief Diversity Officer or CDO to serve that coordinating and centralizing function and we would make this a long term goal; a CDO needs to be our aspiration.

In the meantime, JCU should have a diversity steering committee that includes at least one member from each division (for these purposes, the faculty should be considered an entity separate from academic administration with both having a seat on the steering committee) to serve that coordinating, centralizing function. The steering committee, chaired by the president's designee, would report to the Office of the President and would be empowered to hold people and offices accountable. The steering committee would set institutional goals and measure progress toward them. Those goals should include the recommendations contained herein. Subsequent goals, recommendations and actions should be developed by the steering committee and in consultation with others to realize our commitment to diversity. We acknowledge and argue that the creation of such a committee is not the solution but instead is a channel through which to create change (Williams, Berger and McLendon, p.14).

Strategy 1:2 Articulate Institutional Commitment to Diversity

Below is a statement refined and endorsed by the Task Force and originally developed by the participants in the first Intergroup Dialogue.

<div align="center">John Carroll University's Statement on Diversity</div>

John Carroll University welcomes all expressions of diversity that are in keeping with the Ignatian tradition of fostering an inclusive, compassionate, and respectful environment for our students, faculty, staff, administrators, and guests. Within this tradition, John Carroll University values the unique qualities in all individuals and the opportunity to learn from their many life experiences. Our pursuit of excellence demands that we come to understand and embrace the richness of ideas and ways of thinking each person brings to the university community. We are committed to creating a campus climate in which our differences are explored openly and respectfully.

We seek to enable all members of the John Carroll community to develop their intellectual, spiritual, and vocational interests. This can only be realized in an environment that recognizes both the distinctiveness of each person's experience and

the common humanity that unites us all, taking full advantage of everyone's talents, skills, backgrounds, and perspectives.

In our recruitment efforts, curriculum, programs, and all campus activities, we seek to reflect the following dimensions of diversity.

Race
Ethnicity
Gender
Sexual Orientation
Socioeconomic background
Religion or spiritual affiliation
Age
Disability
Nationality
Gender identity
Veteran status
Intellectual perspective

A statement such as this should be visible throughout the campus and should be widely circulated, examined and discussed. The diversity steering committee might have among its responsibilities calling attention to the university's commitment to diversity.

Strategy 1:3 Require each division of the university to establish goals for advancing inclusion, diversity and cultural competence and articulate ways of attaining them.

While the task force acknowledges and appreciates the need for continued grassroots energy and as discussed above, would argue that meaningful change will require an understanding of cultural competence by individuals at the institution, that sort of transformation is not likely on a large scale without some organizational commitment as the impetus for change. Further, the need for greater centralization suggests that there must be intentional planning throughout the university. Given the specialization of function within each division, it is appropriate to ask each division to articulate how their work can contribute to inclusive excellence. Each division would presumably share those goals with the diversity steering committee who would monitor progress toward attaining those goals.

GOAL 2: To provide more institutionalized and centralized support for members of the JCU community who experience exclusion or discrimination

Strategy 2:1 Establish Ombudspeople

A committee examining how best to structure an Ombudsperson Office has been working since January 2009. The task force endorses this step and sees the existence of an ombudsperson (or body), particularly for students, staff and administrators as a necessary next step in demonstrating our organizational commitment to inclusion.

Strategy 2:2 Create an Office of Diversity and Inclusion

This would not be a new office in the sense of adding personnel or staff it but instead an entity that integrates the various bodies that currently attend to issues of diversity and

inclusion including but not exclusive to Equal Employment Opportunity (e.g. that the people preparing the affirmative action plan for faculty are aware of what is included in the plan for staff and administrators and vice-versa), student issues, etc. Such an office would presumably lead to more structural integration. The Director of this office could be a current employee with this function added to his/her portfolio. Or at such time we can hire a CDO, that person could lead this effort. The coordinating body mentioned above would be the transition from the task force to the Office of Diversity and Inclusion and could eventually serve as the advisory board for the office.

IV. Curriculum

Changes in how and what is taught, in both the formal curriculum and the co-curriculum, is essential to fostering a culturally competent campus. Such changes challenge those who teach to reexamine pertinent literature, arguments and perhaps their own assumptions and behaviors. Such changes challenge students to think critically and to engage in sustained dialogue about the goals, purposes and implications of a commitment to diversity, inclusion and cultural competence. Academic credit remains the currency of the institution and thus the incentives for students to attend to the matters at hand in class suggest a more robust engagement with the issues referenced throughout this report. The curriculum has a symbolic value too. What is included and highlighted sends a powerful message to both internal and external constituencies.

While the diversity (D), and international (R or required to focus on Asia, Africa and Latin America and S or second course that can focus on Europe) requirements are laudable and were sufficiently innovative in 1995 when this core curriculum was adopted, they now exist on the margins of the curriculum and are too often seen as requirement to check off. We know that the D requirement is most often fulfilled by SC 101 (Introduction to Sociology) and CO 200 (Interpersonal Communications). Of the 17,721 students enrolled in a D course since 1996, 5887 or 33% of them have been students in SC 101 and 12% have been enrolled in CO 200. No other course exceeds 5%. Of those students who take but one D course, 55% elect to fulfill the requirement via SC 101, nearly 12% take ED 253 (School and Society) and approximately 9% take CO 200. No other single course exceeds 2%. While these are all presumably relevant and appropriate courses worthy of inclusion in the formal curriculum, they are mostly introductory courses. The task force is concerned that depth is deemphasized relative to breadth (at least in terms of how students are most likely to fulfill the requirements) and that our students need additional course content with regard to inclusion; it needs to be more central to their academic experience. The following goal and strategies to achieve it, then, acknowledge that at John Carroll is lagging behind our peer and aspirant institutions with regard to providing a robust and rigorous course of study that demands that all students appreciate diversity, strive for inclusiveness and are culturally competent. This goal and these strategies, we would argue, will be more effective vehicles by which to attain the institutional learning outcome associated with diversity and inclusion.

GOAL 3 Ensure the depth as well as breadth of study with regard to diversity, inclusion and cultural competence is part of every student's experience at JCU

Strategy 3:1 require a diversity/inclusion course in each major and/or program

This requirement would not likely demand the development of many new courses. Instead, it is more likely that programs would need to reexamine their requirements to

ensure that students attend to issues of diversity and inclusion as part of their major program. While it may seem that some disciplines more easily lend themselves to this requirement, it is conceivable that support courses (offered by other departments) could serve this function as well. If not, a few major programs may need to imagine a new course that emphasizes inclusion and diversity.

Strategy 3:2 Develop (or elevate) curricular programs that deepen understanding of inclusion, privilege, and oppression – e.g. Women's Studies, Africana Studies

The visibility and existence of such programs sends a powerful message about what is valued by the institution. Institutional support for these programs (e.g. seed money) helps to nurture a commitment to inclusion and diversity and promises a depth and rigor to students enrolled in these courses. Those students can also help to change the institutional culture assuming their curricular experiences inform the perspective they bring to their co-curricular experiences and their interactions with their peers.

Strategy 3:3 Require an experiential learning opportunity for graduation (one that deepens cultural competence)

This requirement could be embedded in core courses, major programs (e.g. internships, study abroad, service learning courses) but need not be (e.g. service immersions, study tours, intergroup dialogues). The review and approval of appropriate experiences could be embedded in the curriculum review process likely to result from the work of the Academic Planning Task Force and conducted in consultation with the Diversity Steering Committee. The current literature in higher education suggests that it is through "high impact pedagogies" such as these that meaningful and intentional learning can shape subsequent behavior and decisions.

Strategy 3:4 Expand the successful Intergroup Dialogue program for students so that more can participate and make it credit-bearing

Much as the Task Force on Diversity realized that authentic dialogue and conversation across difference (in institutional status as well as background, experience and demographic characteristics) was essential for change to occur, our student body would benefit from sustained and facilitated interaction that allows them to confront difference in ways that illuminates commonalities. Many institutions offer highly successful intergroup dialogue programs (e.g. University of Michigan, Syracuse University, Occidental College) and the data assessing these programs suggest that they are powerful tools in educating students about diversity and inclusion. They work largely because they meet students where they are. In other words, students understand themselves and their own cultural identities better which allows them to talk with and listen to others across difference while also recognizing similarities. We offered a modest, non-credit bearing dialogue program for students in 2008-2009. The task force recommends that the program be formalized, expanded and supported appropriately.

V. Campus Culture and Climate

Campus climate refers to the development of a psychological and behavioral climate supportive of all students. Indicators of climate include the feelings of belonging among ethnically and racially diverse groups on campus, intergroup relations and behaviors on campus, attitudes toward members of diverse groups and incidents of harassment based

on race, ethnicity, gender and sexual orientation (Williams, Berger and McClendon, 2005; Smith et al., 1997, Hurtado et al.,1999).

A healthy climate, then, has several attributes or indicators. Members of the community avoid "homogenization" of groups or assuming that all members of a group share attitudes, dispositions. The lone member of that group in a meeting or classroom is never asked to "speak" for that group. Members of the community have a working knowledge of the operative concepts like culture, race, class, sexual orientation. And a critical mass of the community understands that culture does not mean "different from the norm of the dominant group ("white norm")." Instead, cultures are understood as a set of practices involving habits of interactions, communicative codes, norms of behavior and artistic expressions which point to coherent systems of meanings and values (Moya 2002, 158).

In order to foster a healthy climate, one must understand one's own political, economic, social, moral and epistemic (how we know what we know) location. We start from the premise that assimilation is not always the answer and that none of us but especially those in the majority group should use solely an emphasis on charity (as contrasted to a commitment to justice or solidarity) when encountering difference. This requires some understanding of power dynamics within the university and inside the classroom.

Perhaps most significantly, we appreciate that the work necessary to develop, nurture and sustain a healthy climate that is culturally competent may engender some conflict and that conflict—or the robust exchange of ideas – should be seen as an opportunity for moral and intellectual growth. Too often we avoid rather than engage the difficult conversation.

Our sense of urgency with regard to culture and climate has been informed by anecdotal evidence of classroom climate provided by the Office of Multicultural Affairs, the experiences of numerous Student Affairs and Enrollment professionals (on the task force and off) and the narratives provided by the Faculty of Color Organization. We anticipate that the campus climate survey being conducted by FOCO and the Center for Faculty Development in the fall of 2009 will corroborate these observations and perceptions and will help determine how widespread experiences of isolation and exclusion are. The examples of which we have been made aware are sufficiently egregious to warrant an institutional response; the climate survey may highlight additional issues that could inform the work of the diversity steering committee. For example, the response of isolated students to the outcome of last year's presidential election or the lack of sensitivity to the Winter Formal Theme of 2007 or students having their racial identity linked to their tardiness for class or students being verbally and physically harassed due to sexual orientation indicate the need for a coordinated and centralized institutional response and strategy to alter climate and culture.

The following recommendations, then, are designed to maximize the likelihood that our campus culture and climate will be welcoming to all and that our commitment to inclusion and diversity will be apparent.

GOAL 4: Create classroom climates that are inclusive and culturally competent

Strategy 4:1: Clear Processes, Policies and Procedures for Reporting and Addressing Bias and Harassment within classrooms should be promulgated and enforced

The university has a clear policy and procedure with regard to sexual harassment. And the Employee Handbook for staff and administrators includes clear language with regard to policy and procedures when employees seek a redress for grievances. Yet at present there is not a clearly articulated protocol for students who perceive exclusion and discrimination in the classroom. Without such a protocol and clearly stated process, there are also no guarantees of due process when allegations toward instructors are made. Too often now experiences are shared anecdotally with ad hoc responses and actions resulting as noted above. Data gathered by the Division of Student Affairs reveal that 41% of students of color responded that they have heard faculty express racial stereotypes in class (contrasted with 24% of white students). The task force strongly recommends that a body be charged with promulgating a procedure through which students can bring concerns as well as identifying a process that protects the rights and interests of both instructors and students in the wake of concerns being expressed.

Strategy 4:2: Provide ongoing faculty development about effective and inclusive pedagogies

In light of the student experiences with which we have been made aware, members of the task force appreciate that some perceived incidents of exclusion and discrimination may not have been intentional by the instructor. The lack of intent, of course, does not lessen the impact on students (may intensify it in some cases). Still, we are persuaded that ongoing, focused and sustained faculty development may help to alter the classroom climate. Indeed, the instances when a student from a historically underrepresented population is singled out and asked to "speak" for that group would presumably disappear once awareness and consciousness is raised. The model of Inclusive Excellence notes that inclusion and academic excellence need to be coupled instead of seen as competing. Student anecdotes again suggest that too often instructors make assumptions about academic preparedness and intellectual ability on the basis of group membership. At the same time, how we teach may need to change as we diversify our student body. The emergence of the Center for Faculty Development provides the necessary infrastructure to educate faculty about how to teach in culturally competent ways.

GOAL 5 Fostering climate of inclusion for students

Strategy 5:1 Institutionalize the Student Diversity Initiatives Working Group (SDIWG)

The SDIWG has launched numerous initiatives including a Student Leaders Summit and the "I Think, I Respect" campaign to begin the school year. This group has also supported student participation in the annual White Privilege Conference and has helped those students work to raise consciousness among other students. To date, the group has lacked an operating budget or clear mandate. Institutionalizing the group with a clear charge to alter the campus climate has the potential to effect meaningful change. This group includes Residence Life, Student Activities, Orientation, and Multicultural Affairs and many of the key stakeholders in Student Affairs. Its membership should be expanded to include all key stakeholders in Student Affairs (i.e. Athletics, Campus Ministry) with appropriate liaisons from Academic Affairs (Center for Service and Social Action, Office of Faculty Diversity).

Strategy 5:2 Send a team of students and FSAs each year to relevant and appropriate workshops (such as the National Coalition Building Institute (NCBI))

Student development and engagement and leadership on issues of inclusion and diversity are essential to change the campus climate. For example, assessment and evaluative data suggest that immersion trips are transformative and one of the most powerful vehicles through which we challenge our students to think about privilege, power and exclusion. Similarly, anecdotal evidence suggests that students who attend the White Privilege Conference are challenged and motivated to effect change. Finding additional vehicles to mobilize students to lead change efforts are likely to be more successful than relying solely on programming provided on campus. The NCBI has a national reputation for helping participants develop the skills that allow them to further "cultural competence, collaboration and partnerships and effective relationships within and across group identities." The National Coalition Building Institute is an "international non-profit leadership development network dedicated to the elimination of racism and other forms of oppression and is rooted in an understanding of individual, community, and systemic change" (www.ncbi.org) and is illustrative of the kind of intentional training that would benefit members of our community.

In addition to sending a team of students to the student specific NCBI, it would be beneficial to send a team of FSAs each year to this or a similar workshop designed for campus professionals. This training has the potential to both enhance the climate for students and for FSAs. Ideally, members of each division would eventually have the opportunity to participate in such trainings with the possibility of those participating eventually serving as trainers on campus.

Strategy 5:3 Revisit student conduct policies and process for acts of intolerance that are between and among students

In addition to clear policies and procedures with regard to classroom climate issues, a committee should be charged with examining the effectiveness of the student conduct policy and process for responding to acts of exclusion or intolerance within the student body. The task force was made aware of many such instances on the basis of race, sex and sexual orientation. Student Affairs data indicate that 38% of students of color agree that there is a lot of racial tension on campus and nearly 1/5 of white students concur. Whether students fully appreciate their recourse or know how to navigate the system and find appropriate supports was not clear to members of the task force. A more intentional process that focuses on diversity, inclusion and cultural competence would serve all students well as it could be a locus for student learning as well as discipline.

GOAL 6 Foster a climate of inclusion for FSAs

Strategy 6:1: Include sexual orientation more explicitly and intentionally in university policies and statements

JCU has given explicit attention in recent years to exclusion on the basis of race, sex, and class. Sexual orientation has yet to receive the same systematic attention and explicit efforts to foster cultural competence and inclusion. Yet there is sufficient evidence that exclusion on the basis of sexual orientation is experienced by faculty, staff, administrators and most especially students. Much of this data is anecdotal, perhaps in part because this issue has not historically been embraced by the campus (e.g. the challenges chartering Allies as a student organization in the not too distant past, the seeming higher level of scrutiny to which Allies programs are held relative to other student organizations). Efforts to organize a "safe space" campaign stalled approximately five years ago. All this suggests that a more intentional and explicit effort to ensure that the climate is inclusive

for the LGBT population is necessary. The inclusion of sexual orientation in a diversity or inclusion vision statement as well as a presidential statement on diversity (perhaps in response to this report) would be appropriate first steps. (The Commitment to Diversity Statement previously referenced provides one opportunity to convey this commitment).

Strategy 6:2 Include sexual orientation in anti-discrimination policy

The faculty endorsed the recommendation in October of 2008 that sexual orientation be included in the non-discrimination policy. The task force supports this recommendation and would encourage a formal and positive response to the faculty vote. This response could initiate productive discourse that has the potential to make the climate for those in our community who identify as LGBT more welcoming. Task force members are concerned that the absence of sexual orientation in the non-discrimination policy sends a powerful message to both internal and external constituencies.

Strategy 6:3: Require Cultural Competence Training for all managers and supervisors including department chairs and make it available to others

As noted throughout this report, changing individual level behavior is perhaps the most significant (and daunting) undertaking if we are to achieve our inclusion and diversity goals. Raising consciousness and awareness – understanding better the inadvertent ways in which some members of our community experience exclusion – is essential. While some of these elements of awareness and behavioral change need to happen spontaneously and informally, significant institutional change will not occur without intentional and thoughtful efforts to challenge assumptions, confront behavior and provide incentives for changed behavior. Those in supervisory roles need to first and foremost understand their legal responsibilities (e.g. the EEOC training tentatively scheduled for November 2009) but also would benefit from additional workshops and trainings that focus on fostering an inclusive work environment, effective communication (across difference) and methods of holding others accountable when they are not demonstrating cultural competence.

Strategy 6:3: Add question to Annual Evaluations for FSAs that asks for contributions to advancing inclusion and diversity

If a commitment to inclusion and diversity is to be understood as central to institutional mission and institutional effectiveness, then it is imperative that the expectation be made clear and that members of the community be held accountable for the ways in which they do (or do not) contribute to advancing that commitment. In much the same way that staff and administrators have been asked to reflect on their commitment to mission and identity in formal evaluations, it makes sense to ask faculty, staff and administrators to document the ways in which they have helped to promote inclusive excellence.

Strategy 6:4: Strengthen and require tenure committee workshops

The Faculty of Color Organization and the Faculty Women's Caucus have noted since their inception that departmental tenure committees could be the locus of exclusionary behavior. In response, annual workshops focused on clear and effective communication to tenure candidates have been conducted. While strongly encouraged, participation in them has not yet been required. And while the content of the workshop has been instructive and worthwhile, cultural bias has not (yet) been the focus of the conversation. A logical next step in the professional development of members of tenure committees

would be the expectation that tenure committees be better educated as to the meaning and desirability of being culturally competent in the workplace.

VI. Access and Equity

Access and Equity is the final dimension of Inclusive Excellence to be discussed. It can be defined as the compositional number and success levels of historically underrepresented students, faculty, and staff in higher education. Research indicates that increasing the number of students, faculty and staff of color promotes existing recruitment and retention efforts and transforms institutional culture (Hurtado et.al., 1999). Sample Performance Indicators include the number of faculty, staff and administrators of color at the institution, the number of female faculty, staff and administrators and the changes in these numbers over time.

Setting goals and targets requires knowledge of the status quo and past patterns of employment. While a diverse workforce extends beyond the characteristics of sex and race, data are only collected for those attributes. As of 2008, women constitute 51% of the administration, 39% of the faculty and 76% of the staff. People of color comprise 11% of the administration, 11% of the faculty and 11% of the staff as of 2008.

Efforts to enhance access and equity are used to reflect the entirety of diversity efforts on most campuses and in most workplaces. It is intentionally placed last in this report because while it still matters, we now understand that changes in demographic representation on their own will not alter culture and climate nor foster inclusion. These efforts to alter structural diversity are likely hampered unless other dimensions are given serious attention. Otherwise, the work too often falls to members of underrepresented groups to address the other dimensions of inclusive excellence. This can be burdensome and can also mitigate against the commitment to diversity, inclusion and cultural competence being shared and owned by all members of the organization. Instead, the work needs to be central for all, which will facilitate greater access and equity.

Moreover, we have also made meaningful strides in enhancing structural diversity in recent years. For example, the new faculty in 2009 included a majority of women and a critical mass of faculty who identify as Asian or Asian American. Similarly, the staff has become more racially diverse in recent years with 6% of the staff identifying as people of color in 2004 as compared with 11% of the staff in 2008.

Still, according to the affirmative action plans for both faculty and staff/administrators, there is work that remains. The affirmative action plans are prepared and monitored by the Office of the AVP (for faculty) and the Office of Human Resources (for staff/administrators). These plans rely on federal standards for defining job categories and utilize national data for determining availability for various positions and thus determining if JCU adequately utilizes the available pool when making hiring decisions.

For example, according to the 2008 AAP for faculty, women are underutilized by 10 faculty lines and people of color are underutilized by two faculty lines according to federal standards. (Utilization is determined by calculating availability of women and racial minority Ph.D.s across disciplines.) Further, compliance with federal guidelines is the minimum standard for diversifying the faculty in our judgment. Ideally, we would exceed compliance with the law.

In terms of the current composition of the administration, several job categories have been identified as under-representing historically disadvantaged populations including senior management (on basis of sex), middle management (on basis of race), researchers and counselors (on basis of race), IT professionals (on basis of sex), library professionals (sex), semi-skilled (sex and race), drivers (sex), and security (race).

The racial diversity of the student body reached an all time high in 2008. Eleven per cent of the student body identified as a racial minority showing a 2% increase from the previous year. While graduate enrollments had slightly higher numbers of racial minority students over the past decade, in 2008 those numbers mirrored total undergraduate enrollment (11.0%) and freshman racial minority enrollment (11.4%). So while the data are trending upward, we think that continued vigilance is necessary to sustain this trend. Given the racial composition of Northeast Ohio generally and the city of Cleveland specifically, a commitment to continue to grow the numbers of students of color is appropriate and worthwhile.

Enrollment patterns on the basis of sex indicate that women now outnumber men in undergraduate and graduate enrollments (2046 women to 1780 men in 2008). There is a wider gap in graduate enrollments (456 women to 253 men) than in undergraduate (1590 women to 1527 men). While these patterns bear watching, we think there is sufficient parity on the basis of sex at the current time.

Based on our understanding of the status quo with regard to access and equity and based on our working assumptions, we have generated the following goals and strategies for implementing them with regard to access and equity. These recommendations are undergirded by the supposition that in order for us to move from isolated although effective programs to a genuine and authentic institutional commitment to diversity and inclusion, we must also create accountability for success.

Access and Equity Recommendations

GOAL 7: Further diversify faculty, staff and administration on basis of race and sex

Strategy 7:1: Identify and address cultural biases in search and hiring process for Faculty, Staff and Administrators

Preliminary steps have been taken and should be continued. Meetings with search committee chairs that have provided resources and suggestions for diversifying pools seem to have yielded some positive results. Next steps include additional training with regard to the evaluation of credentials as well as optimal interview protocols. Search committees have been encouraged to provide candidates with the opportunities to meet with relevant constituencies outside the hiring department; making that an expectation rather than a suggestion is worth pursuing.

Strategy 7:2: Centralize tracking of faculty applicant pools including disposition information

In the recent past, faculty search committee chairs would report the diversity of the applicant pool. Since 2007, applicants have been asked to self-report with the hiring departments distributing the survey. We will centralize this function in 2009 and the Office of Institutional Research will gather, analyze and report the data. To date, we have not systematically asked search committees to explain why successful candidates emerged.

(By contrast, staff and administrator searches include disposition information that is provided to the Office of Human Resources). Gathering that information will help us understand better if there are any hidden hiring biases.

Strategy 7:3: Make Affirmative Action Plans more visible and prospective

The affirmative action plans prepared annually include rich data with regard to realistic expectations of the expected extent of diversity in the workforce. Greater awareness of hiring managers as to the availability of members of historically underrepresented populations might serve to provide additional incentive to be more intentional with regard to diversity in recruitment and hiring. Further, sharing the information included in those plans more widely is likely to heighten consciousness about the goals and expectations. The lack of conversation and discussion of the affirmative action plans can inadvertently send the message that compliance with external standards is the goal of preparing the plan.

GOAL 8: Further diversify student body

Strategy 8:1 Convey commitment to inclusion and diversity to prospective students

The purpose of such an emphasis in student recruitment would be to signal to prospective students that our commitment to inclusion and diversity is taken seriously and is central to our mission and identity. Making this commitment central to our recruitment strategy may well encourage a more diverse applicant pool. Continued visits to urban schools, to public schools and perhaps considering an emphasis on international student recruitment conveys this commitment with the potential to yield a more diverse student body.

Strategy 8:2 Strengthen Orientation (summer, fall, perhaps ongoing throughout first year) to foster cultural competence

Encouraging entering students to reflect on their own understanding and experience with inclusion and diversity should help prepare them for their educational experience and may make them more open and receptive to opportunities and programs they are likely to encounter while at JCU. This emphasis would also acknowledge that our students come from a variety of backgrounds and levels of familiarity with their own cultures and their ability to see beyond their own experiences to understand other cultures. Meeting each of them where they are and helping them identify their own cultural background is the first necessary step in acquiring a level of cultural competence sufficient to interact meaningfully with those from different cultural backgrounds.

Strategy 8:2 Create a coordinating Body to attend to Student Transition and Success (inclusive of Enrollment, Student Affairs and Academic Affairs)

Significant strides have been made to facilitate access and retention via the launching of the Ohio Access Initiative, the creation of the Office of Access and Retention and the collaboration between that office and the Center for Service and Social Action. Additional work remains, especially with regard to coordinated academic support that is not merely remedial but helps to identify student strengths and interests allowing for student success. (For example, students interested in the sciences but lacking the scientific literacy of their peers perhaps due to high school opportunities might benefit from a sustained mentoring program allowing them the opportunity to work closely in a

lab with a faculty member or graduate student. Preliminary conversations have begun but lack a clear vision or sense of how these efforts might connect to a more comprehensive student success strategy.) A coordinated strategy for orienting our students from historically underrepresented populations including first generation students as well as students of color needs to be developed. While these populations overlap, there may be distinct needs for each. Whether (and if so, how) to coordinate these programs will require intentional conversation and clear leadership. These efforts have the potential to enhance recruitment efforts and may yield a more diverse (on the basis of race, ethnicity and economic status) student body.

VII. Conclusion

The primary goal of this report is to document the work of the Institutional Task Force on Diversity and to provide an institutional anchor through which to organize subsequent conversations and decisions about diversity, inclusion and cultural competence. The Inclusive Excellence model of AAC&U, in our judgment, provides that framework. We have used that model to articulate goals and strategies and expect that those charged with animating the suggestions emanating from this report will be able to measure progress toward those goals and will be able to hold appropriate entities accountable in ways that will maximize the likelihood of successful attainment of the goals. The Inclusive Excellence scorecard is included in the Appendix and should serve as a useful heuristic and reference as we move forward.

We would advocate and encourage that this report be made public. Its distribution could provide the occasion to organize community conversations about the recommendations contained herein. As we have emphasized throughout this document, a commitment to these goals and strategies and active engagement with them by a wide array of JCU community members is essential for progress. Public dissemination of the report could begin that process. A town hall meeting might be appropriate. Presenting these recommendations to more targeted constituencies is probably also worthwhile.

The primary theme of this report is a call to action and a need to appreciate the centrality of this work for our institutional vitality. The information we have gathered and the conversations we have had persuade us that the culture and climate are not sufficiently welcoming to many on our campus, the curriculum is not sufficiently robust to challenge and educate our students about multiculturalism and the demographics of the campus remain relatively homogeneous given the population of Northeast Ohio and the U.S. Restructuring and reorganization that will require cooperation and collaboration across divisions are necessary in our judgment for significant progress to continue. We hope the goals and strategies contained herein will serve as a catalyst for change and will provide a useful outline of next steps to foster a campus community that is diverse, inclusive and culturally competent.

Figure 3. Inclusive Excellence Scorecard.

REFERENCES

Clayton-Pederson, Alma and Caryn McTighe Musil. 2005. Introduction to *Making Excellence Inclusive: Preparing Students and Campuses for an Era of Greater Expectations.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges and Universities.

Clayton-Pederson, Alma and Caryn McTighe Musil and Nancy O'Neill. 2007. *Making Excellence Inclusive: A Framework for Embedding Diversity and Inclusion into Colleges and Universities' Academic Excellence Mission.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges and Universities.

Hurtado, S., J. F. Milem, A. R. Clayton-Pedersen, and W. R. Allen. 1999. *Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education*. ASHE-ERIC Report. Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

Moya, Paula. 2002. *Learning from Experience.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Smith, Daryl. 1997. "How Diversity Influences Learning." *Liberal Education* 83(2): 42-7.

Williams, Damon, Joseph Berger and Sheldon McClendon. 2005. "Toward a Model of Inclusive Excellence and Change in PostSecondary Institutions." Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges and Universities.