Diversity Task Force Report
For Consideration by the Faculty at the Assembly of 11 April 2012

Submitted by:
Maya Baum, Undergraduate Representative (Second Year)
Esteban Cardemil, Associate Professor of Psychology
Amy Daly Gardner, Director of Intercultural Affairs
SunHee Kim Gertz, Professor of English
Esther Jones, Assistant Professor of English
Andy McGadney, Vice-President of University Advancement
Mounira Morris, Assistant Dean of Students for ALANA Student Support
Ravi Perry, Assistant Professor of Political Science
Paris Prince, Graduate Representative, GSOM
Hannah Yukon, Undergraduate Representative (Second Year)
Table of Contents

Acknowledgements 3
Preface 5
Introduction 6
Diversity Task Force Process 6
Brief History of Diversity at Clark University, Even More Briefly Contextualized 8
National Trends and Clark 10
Brief Overview of Comparable Universities’ Efforts to Implement Diversity 15
  Process 15
  Structures at Other Institutions 17
  Administrative Structures 17
  Observations 18
Clark’s 2001 ad hoc Task Force on Diversity 18
The 2005 Ten-Year and 2010 Fifth Year Reports to NEASC 19
  The 2005 Ten-Year Report 19
  NEASC’s Response 20
  The 2010 Interim Report 20
Clark’s 2006-09 Diversity Committee 20
  Goals 20
  Suggestions 20
  Results 21
Diversity Task Force 2011-12: Surveys 21
  Overview 21
  Procedure 22
  Results 23
  Limitations of the Survey 26
  General Conclusions 26
Priming the Pump 27
Diversity Task Force Recommendations 27
  Establishing an Administrative Structure 27
  Organizing and Implementing 30
Conclusion 39
Sources Incorporated 41
Overview of Appendices 46
Acknowledgements
We are grateful for all the conversations we have been able to hold with faculty, staff, students, and alumnae-/i, both in groups and in one-on-ones. We found it not possible to incorporate the many comments expressed within the confines of this report, but a sense of the richness of the observations and suggestions we garnered may be found in Appendix 1, which records comments offered at these meetings. The response has been stimulating and extremely helpful.

In addition to those we heard from at these meetings, listed in the first pages of the report, the Diversity Task Force is also very grateful for the additional materials, information, assistance, and suggestions contributed by various members of the Clark community, as listed below.

Judging from responses at our meetings as well as the volunteered assistance from those listed here, it does seem that we are ready to take up the responsibility of making diversity and inclusion an integral part of our Clark framework. As you can see from the list below, individuals from every level of the Clark community—students, staff, faculty, administration, and alumnae-/i—have taken the extra step to contribute assistance and thereby show a willingness to be part of improving our campus climate.

Jan Adamec, Assistant to Vice Presidents for Planning and Finance
Professor John Ameer, Education

Dimitry Anselme, Director of Program Staff Development at Facing History and Ourselves, Alum, and Clark Board of Trustees Member
Associate Professor Belen Atienza, Foreign Languages and Literatures
Professor Davis Baird, Provost

Jane Baker, Director of Corporate and Foundation Relations
Associate Professor Mary-Ellen Boyle, GSOM, Associate Dean of the College
Debra S. Brenner, Assistant to the Provost
Professor Nancy Budwig, Associate Provost and Dean of Research
Corine K. Claxton, Claxton Legal and Alum

Paula Connors, Managerial Secretary, English Department

Denise Darrigrand, Vice-President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students
Professor Tom Del Prete, Director of the Hiatt Center and Chair of Education
Professor Jay Elliott, Chair of English and IRB
Professor Priscilla Elsass, Dean of Graduate Studies
Professor Rachel Falmagne, Psychology

Jack Foley, Vice-President for Government and Community Affairs and Campus Services

Uwe Gertz, Coordinator of the Leir Luxembourg Program
Rose Goldich, English Department Work-Study
Professor Janette Greenwood, History

Constance Whitehead Hanks, Assistant Director of Study Abroad
Jeff Himmelberger, Manager of Institutional Research
Melissa Hoffmann, Marketing and Communications Assistant
Donald Honeman, Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid
Associate Professor Betsy Huang, English
Rebecca Hunter, Registrar
Lisa M. Johnson, Senior English Major and President of Student Council
Michael Krikonis, Academic Technologist
Trish MacDonald, Assistant Director, Human Resources/Affirmative Action
Emma Mackie, English Department MA Representative to Graduate Student Council
Ed McDermott, Systems Librarian, Goddard Library
David McDonough, Director of Career Services
Kevin McKenna, Associate Dean of the College
Michael McKenna, Director of Student Leadership and Programming
Andrea Michaels, Associate Provost and Vice President for Budget and Planning
Joaanne Miller, Assistant to the President
Professor Mark Miller, Political Science
Lynn Olson, Director Human Resources and Affirmative Action
Kevin Powell, Activist, Writer, and Clark's 2012 Martin Luther King, Jr. Day Speaker
Terri Rutkiewicz, Graduate Program Assistant, English Department
Fidgi Simeon, Clark Communication and Culture Senior
Assistant Professor of Practice Mark Tigan, iDCE, CDP Program
Professor Shelly Tenenbaum, Sociology
Fordyce Williams, Coordinator of Archives and Special Collections, Goddard Library

Thank you!
Preface

Hannah Yukon reports that she and other fellow sophomores believe that undergraduate apathy could be overcome if diversity and inclusion efforts were more organized. Sophomore Maya Baum observes that only when she sprained her ankle did she gain experiential knowledge of what she had suspected: most of our campus is inaccessible for those who cannot move about with ease. Graduate student Paris Prince notes that Clark and Worcester could benefit from collaborating on diversity and inclusion issues. English Department Managerial Secretary Paula Connors enthusiastically narrates the RISD project aimed at making diversity visible on campus and concludes how wonderful it would be if Clark were to be that proud of our diversity. Director of Human Resources Jacqueline Capomacchio expresses concern that the holiday schedule for staff does not include Martin Luther King, Jr. Day. She further points out that diversity, in terms of cultural diversity, is not featured on our website, confirming the ‘test drive’ made by the Diversity Task Force of about a hundred websites; at that time, in contrast to all other sites, Clark featured the diversity research of GSOM Professor Laura Graves, along with dozens of entries for ecodiversity.

Students, staff, committees, faculty, the academic administration, and alumnae/i have welcomed the Diversity Task Force and provided us with feedback, different viewpoints, reports to consult, and other suggestions, and while all did not share one Department Chair’s intensity, her words do capture a prevailing sentiment. “This is long overdue.”

At Clark, we understand that changes in campus climate with respect to diversity and inclusion can enrich what we do in multiple ways. Yet, we have had to revisit diversity in fora and task forces in the 1980s, the 1990s, 2003, 2009, and again, now. Why?

Thin answers might include the premise that we do not have the funding necessary to dedicate to the effort or that it is impossible to get hold of everything intended by the term ‘diversity.’ Such responses suggest the influence of the ‘old narrative,’ whereby diversity was equivalent to quotas at all costs. What diversity and inclusion mean to us here and now stems, naturally, from that old narrative, but they do not align with it fully, nor with its approach.

We have been using a term, ‘benign neglect’ out of context to describe the starting point of the ‘new narrative.’ While we believe that there is no prevailing animosity towards diversity and inclusion at Clark, there has been the tendency to assume, extremely put, that since we are all for diversity, things will take care of themselves. They will not. It is necessary to be continuously attentive to matters of campus climate, the end point of the ‘new narrative.’ Without constant oversight, we will fall behind, as indeed has been the case at Clark. With respect to diversity and inclusion, neglect cannot be benign.

The Diversity Task Force 2011-12 aims to be the last task force of its kind that Clark convenes. We present here our research on diversity at Clark and in the US, and we propose solutions that we deem to be LEEP-friendly, Faculty Work Task Force-conscious, and budgetarily prudent. In order to ensure on-going vigilance to help Clark become an institution that inspires and takes into account the observations of students like Hannah, Maya, and Paris; taps into the energies of individuals like Paula; responds to the concerns from Jacqueline; and takes up the challenge that many have issued, at the core of our concrete suggestions is a standing diversity and inclusion committee that in the ideal scenario supports a tenured faculty member leading our efforts to improve diversity and inclusion at Clark. We welcome your feedback.
Introduction
Diversity and inclusion comprise an important principle, a nexus at which multiple viewpoints meet and at times clash. Articulating a fundamental standpoint with respect to a just society, diversity and inclusion essentially require that governing bodies instantiate democratic principles in fair and civil manner. As an ideal, diversity calls for Clark to enrich the campus by creating a structure allowing diverse members, present and future, to participate in Clark’s community fully, and inclusion asks that each individual work with his or her fellow members to ensure a climate of respect. As articulated by Ravi Perry, “we encompass diversity [and inclusion] in the broadest sense to include race, color, religion, age, national and ethnic origin, disability, [status as a first generation academic], status as a veteran, language [multiplicity], socioeconomic background, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, political ideology, and theoretical approach” (“A Diversity Action Plan for Clark University,” p. 2). Indeed, in an October 1988 meeting of the Commission for a Pluralistic Community, Economics Professor Bob Hsu, who passed away in 2004, reported that, “people in minority groups feel constrained and can’t be complete in themselves on a campus where they are [made to feel they are] minorities” (University Reports and Planning Documents, Confidential Box F 13-1-2, File Minutes 1988-1989).

With goals such as these aimed at enriching the campus climate, it is imperative, regularly, to assess conditions in order to attain policies and to effect new measures, which has been the guiding stimulus of this report and resulting set of recommendations.

While Clark has been open in principle to diversity and inclusion over the decades, we have not been able to make diversity and inclusion an integral part of our campus culture. As Dimitry Anselme, Clark alumnus and Board of Trustees member, wrote in a recent e-mail, “It has always felt to me that diversity was something valued by individual administrators and faculty at Clark. I have never felt that it was an institutional value or commitment.”

The Diversity Task Force (DIVTF) has concluded that at this point in time it is not only necessary to take stock of what has been accomplished, but also to ensure that increasingly diverse constituencies seeking higher education have a place in our university’s culture. We cannot afford to lose another opportunity.

In order to assess the campus climate, the DIVTF has focused on three groups—students, staff, and faculty—to articulate measures for the benefit of all members in each group, operating under the working hypothesis that if each group’s concerns are taken into account, then the campus climate as a whole can benefit.

Diversity Task Force Process
Clark’s Affirmative Action Plan and Annual Report, from 1 October 2009 to 30 September 2010, states that, “Clark University is committed to creating the most diverse community of faculty, staff, and students possible” (p. 9). In this spirit, the 2011 Academic and Financial Plan mandated the Diversity Task Force, as recorded on pp. 11-12:

Goal 1, Faculty, Staff and Campus Culture: Create a campus culture that inspires intellectual daring and creativity, and that respects, supports, and compensates both faculty and staff in ways that enhance the University’s research and educational missions.

Objectives:
1. **Institutional Diversity**: Provide a campus environment that embraces diversity for faculty, staff and students, and that allows for specific effective steps to be taken to recruit support and retain a faculty that is diverse and whose members are passionate about both teaching and research in a university that blends both.

   a. (2011/13): Develop and implement specific proposals aimed at diversifying the campus, and in particular, at the hiring of minority faculty members.

   b. (2011/12): Create Diversity Task Force [DTF] to assess the current campus environment with respect to diversity, and to propose specific steps for improving the campus culture in this respect and for diversifying the faculty and staff.

   c. (2011/12): Plan and implement enhanced campus racial and ethnic diversity programming involving the reinvigorated Race and Ethnic Relations concentration, and working in conjunction with Intercultural Affairs, the newly hired Asian Studies director, and the launch of the Latin American Studies concentration.

Once the DIVTF was established, we met regularly to arrive at the recommendations closing this report. In addition, we had a series of information-gathering and advisory meetings, including:

- Meetings with Steering, PBR, COP, and IRB
- Monthly Meetings with the Provost
- Meetings with all 17 Academic Departments
- Meetings with Staff, both exempt and non-exempt
- Attendance at a Meeting convened by the Bias Response Team (Amy Daly Gardner, Mounira Morris, and Jason Zelesky, Associate Dean of Students) in response to an incident
- Meetings with Students, both undergraduate and graduate
- Facebook and e-mail communication with Students, both undergraduate and graduate, especially with respect to an event, *Diversity on the Green*, to be held on April 15th
- Individual meetings (chronologically arranged) with:
  - Denise Darrigrand, Vice-President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students
  - Andrea Michaels, Vice President for Budgets, and Lynn Olson, then Director of Human Resources and Affirmative Action
  - Jack Foley, Vice-President for Government and Community Affairs and Campus Services
  - Jacqueline Capomacchio, current Director of Human Resources and Affirmative Action
  - Professor Nancy Budwig, Associate Provost and Dean of Research and Susan Puryear, Director of Sponsored Programs and Research
  - Professor David Angel, President
  - Sean Sullivan, Director of Athletics
  - Donald Honeman, Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid
  - Ashley Klann, Senior English major and Chief Editor of the *Scarlet*
  - Students in the English Department’s *Ethnic America* seminar: Megan Anderson, Chris Booth, Jane Carper, Seokyeong Choi, Jean Dao, Anthony Ebstein, Luisa Furstenberg-Beckman, Christine

---
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Kerz, Tricia Labbe, Hannah Lee, Gregory MacPhee, Anna Meserve, Alana Osborn-Lief, Abigail Stone
- Professors Bill Fisher and Laurie Ross, IDCE
- Professor Kristen Williams, Chair of the Faculty
- Professor Fern Johnson, English Department
- Professor Valerie Sperling, Chair of COP
- Paula David, Vice-President for Marketing and Communication
- Chelsea Kryspin, Undergraduate Treasurer of OPEN
- Denise Darrigrand, Vice-President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students
- Jennifer Plante, Director of the Writing Center
- Professor Robert Ross, Sociology Department
- Jane Daigneault, Associate Director/Coordinator of Disability Services
- Wes Gadson, Director of Academic Advancement
- Mable L. Millner, Assistant Dean of Students and Director of Multicultural Education, College of the Holy Cross

Likewise, the DIVTF served in an advisory capacity to the search for a new Director of Human Resources and Affirmative Action.

Further, Goddard’s archives along with published materials were consulted to survey Clark’s history with respect to diversity.

Critically, to help assess the information gathered and to hear from more voices, three surveys authored and assessed by Professor Esteban Cardemil were administered to the entire Clark community.

Finally, in order to place Clark in the US context, a wide variety of materials including scholarly articles, reports, journalistic columns, book-length studies, and university websites were consulted.

**Brief History of Diversity at Clark University, Even More Briefly Contextualized**

Clark University was founded in 1887, as the second all-graduate institution in the US, admitting at that time only men. Early on, Clark encouraged international relations, as most famously exemplified by the Freud-Jung lectures that took place in 1909. Perhaps more importantly, however, George H. Blakeslee, who was a founder of the academic field of international relations, was a Clark faculty member (1903-1943). In 1902, Clark College opened its doors to undergraduates. Clark’s first African American undergraduate, Louis C. Tyree, earned his degree in 1912 (the first African American BA in the US, Alexander Lucius Twilight, graduated in 1823, from Middlebury College, founded in 1800). In 1920, Francis C. Sumner became the first African American to graduate with a PhD in Psychology from any American University (the first African American PhD *per se*, Edward A. Bouchet, earned his degree from Yale in 1876, in physics). In 1942, women were admitted to the Women’s College of Clark University. In 1967, Alice Higgins became the first woman to chair a board of a US private research university.

Under Lyndon B. Johnson (1963–69), affirmative action policies originally proposed by John F. Kennedy in 1963, were instituted via the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (which included the creation of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission) and an executive order in 1965. According to the National Center
for Education Statistics, “Between 1976 and 2004, the percentage of total undergraduate enrollment who were minority students increased from 17 to 32 percent. By 1980, the percentage of females enrolled as undergraduates surpassed the percentage of males enrolled as undergraduates. In 2004, the gender gap was largest for Black undergraduates” (See Appendix 2).

What follows is a list of measures overtly related to diversity starting in 1977, suggesting that diversity policy at Clark, formally and informally, was often aimed at increasing the numbers of traditionally underrepresented groups and at enhancing academic offerings (for examples of standard policies, see Appendix 3).

1977 A Report by the Affirmative Action Task Force was filed.
1978-1988 Dolores Osborne, Clark’s first Affirmative Action Officer (a part-time appointment) reported to the President, followed by Linda Cooper.
1979 The Women’s Studies Program was launched.
1980 A 214-page Affirmative Action Plan was submitted.
1983 Clark established its first set of Sexual Harassment Rules.
1984-2000 Under Richard P. Traina, admissions policies and support systems for African American students were initiated, but strife in the 1990s created setbacks.
1986-1987 Assistant Dean of Students/Minority Affairs and Student Life Deborah Dorman was replaced by Catherine Maddox-Wiley.
1988-1993 Hermenia Gardner, Affirmative Action Officer (a full-time appointment) reported to the President, who made hiring diversely her chief priority.
1988 In response to a faculty and student-membered Committee Against Intolerance, the Commission for a Pluralistic Community was established.
1988-93 The Human Relations Committee was established, with “an advisory and programmatic role on issues related to race, ethnicity, gender and sexuality, with a goal to improve the campus experience for underrepresented populations of students.” (e-mail from Denise Darrigrand, 20 March 2012)
1993-1996 Maria Gomez, Affirmative Action Officer (a full-time appointment) reported to the Director of Human Resources/Affirmative Action, indicating a shift in focus.
Fall 1993 The Race and Ethnicity Concentration proposal was submitted to UAB.
1995 The E. Franklin Frazier Chair was established.
1996-2004 Evon Walters began with a 1/3 placement in multicultural affairs to become the Assistant Dean of Students for Multicultural Affairs by the end of the year; he was followed by Anthony Hopson, Oscar Jones, and Jennifer Matos, who also became responsible for GLBT Affairs.
1998 The Strassler Center for Holocaust and Genocide Studies was established.
1999-2000 A Hewlett Foundation Grant was awarded to relocate the Bethune Multicultural Center to Dana Commons, and Lisa Moore was appointed as its Director, followed by Lydia Fortune.
2000 A Report in December advocated the creation of an ad hoc task force on campus diversity, subsequently convened in February 2001.
2006 The Women’s Studies major was approved.
2006 Then Provost David Angel initiated a diversity committee, whose last meeting was convened in 2009.
2004 Director of Academic Advancement Wes Gadson was hired.
2008 Assistant Dean of Students for ALANA Student Support Mounira Morris was hired.
2009  “A Diversity Action Plan for Clark University” was formulated but not circulated.
2010-11 Maria Acosta Cruz and Paul Posner co-founded the Latin American and Latino Studies concentration.
April 2011 A Diversity Task Force was mandated by the 2011 Academic and Financial Plan.

National Trends and Clark
We have used the term ‘benign neglect’ out of context to designate Clark’s positive inclination towards a more diverse and inclusive campus culture that, however, has not resulted in overarching policies for improving diversity and inclusion, mainly for want of guidance and a constant administrative presence. As Richard L. Marcus summarizes, the phrase was made popular by Patrick Moynihan with respect to race relations in 1969; in a memo to President Nixon, Moynihan advocated a policy of “benign neglect,” as did the Earl of Durham in 1839, towards Canada (p. 2008). Thus, Jacob Heilbrunn reports, Moynihan “had urged the administration to focus on jobs programs rather than race” (p.3). In a period of racial turmoil, that is, Moynihan advised that causes for racial unrest be neglected and a relatively simpler problem be addressed. The problem with ‘benign neglect’ is, as stated in the Preface, that such neglect cannot really be benign, for what actually emerges is a dissipation of energy and a complacent lack of focus that can destroy or hamper gains made.

In the US, discussions, data, and measures introduced over the last few years suggest that what we are currently experiencing is a fraught time for diversity policies and hence a good time to take stock. Below are some of the currents informing this critical period for diversity at the national level.

Please note: While discussions at the national level focus primarily on race and ethnicity, this DIVTF seeks to be more inclusive, as stated above, seeking solutions for how the whole campus can benefit from creating conditions that encourage respect for how any responsible individual self-identifies.

• As reported by Adam Liptak in the New York Times in October 2011, and again in February 2012, the implementation of diversity in academic institutional policies is at risk, with underrepresented racial groups at the heart of the tension, as the Supreme Court has agreed to hear the Fisher v. University of Texas challenge with respect to admission policies. The Supreme Court is scheduled for a decision in June.

• Underscoring how complex diversity legislation for universities is, Patrick McGreevy and Anthony York of the Los Angeles Times reported on 9 October 2011, that about a week earlier Governor Brown’s contested signing of the California Dream Act emerged in a tangle of measures that concomitantly prevented state universities from considering an applicant’s race, gender, and income while improving conditions for sexual diversity.

• In December 2011, according to the New York Times’ Sam Dillon, the Obama administration urged college admissions officials to take measures that would improve racial diversity among institutions of higher education, issuing a 10-page guide with suggestions on how, essentially, to adhere to the letter of recent Supreme Court decisions, but not necessarily to their spirit and thereby in effect reverse 2008 Bush guidelines.
• In covering the Council of Graduate Schools annual meeting that took place in December 2011, Stacey Patton wrote for The Chronicle, reporting that Scott E. Page, “presented empirical evidence to suggest that diverse groups of people outperform homogenous groups in the classroom and in work settings” (p.3). Indeed, as Jeanne Arnold and Marlene Kowalski-Braun write, “Research has established that teaching students about diversity is critical as institutions prepare them for their professional roles and civic responsibilities after graduation” (p. 2). Nonetheless, as Patton observed, “outside the meeting’s scheduled sessions, some deans questioned whether the sense of urgency will reach beyond Scottsdale, Ariz., where the meeting was held, and force hard looks at systemic problems” (p.1).

• Likewise, a study supervised by Donna J. Nelson in 2007, demonstrated that while underrepresented groups and women are increasingly choosing the sciences and engineering at the undergraduate level, this increase has not translated into significant numbers of women becoming faculty. As reported by The Chronicle in 2009, the number of PhDs earned by minority group members and women has increased over time, although when excluding Asians in some scientific fields, the percentages are notably smaller (see Appendix 4).

Overall, numbers of traditionally underrepresented groups entering higher education are on the rise, not only in terms of PhDs awarded, but also in terms of enrolled college students.
The increase in numbers of underrepresented groups entering higher education presents an opportunity to improve our own campus climate. Tuition costs at Clark, however, still remain an obstacle for many. While some measures have been instituted to enable students to remove that obstacle, access is still difficult for many potential applicants. As admonished by a 2009 Delta Cost Project study, although cutting financial support seems to be a viable solution, it is more important to coordinate and plan effectively (pp. 24 ff.). Indeed, Clark could work on creative ways to allow more access to higher education in a fiscally responsible manner when a full picture of what needs to be done for the entire Clark community emerges—the DIVTF has learned of a variety of efforts to do so:

- The Education Department is working with members of our science faculty to encourage University Park School pupils to consider the sciences as a focal point.
- Don Honeman reports that Admissions is working with faculty and staff to encourage students from North Star Academy Charter School of Newark NJ to consider Clark as a destination, an effort initiated by Jarrad Nunes. Even after a very short time, 8 of the 24 academically very strong graduating seniors are applying to Clark. The question remains, however, whether sufficient financial aid will be provided to allow them to attend Clark.
- Likewise, Admissions is working on articulation agreements, now administered by David Opp, in order to connect Clark with community colleges, which typically have a large percentage of
underrepresented students. Admissions allows students from designated community colleges to be admitted to Clark, if they have a 3.0 GPA and meet other requirements. A pre-approval system devised by Kevin McKenna facilitates the process. In spite of efforts put in, it is too early to tell whether this pilot project will be successful. Quinsigamond Community College was the first articulation agreement institution, with the agreement being signed in Spring 2011; after that, Berkshire Community College and Dean Community College followed.

- The Math Department has supported innovative grant proposals with Lawrence Morris as PI and Fred Green as Co-PI, to create mentoring groups for undergraduates in Math, while Li Han volunteers in a Scratch After School Program, engaging children in intuitive, animation-based programming.
- The Director of Career Services, David McDonough, informs us that while the data is soft, because it relies on self-reporting, in 2010, 39% of students participated in an off-campus internship, and 53% participated in community service activities. Student desire to participate in such activities is significant and reflects Clark’s motto, “Challenge convention, change the world,” as well as fitting into LEEP parameters.

If efforts such as these and others were coordinated, they might create synergies, and funding, that would enhance the campus climate; moreover, coordinating these and other activities could help determine the kinds of stresses and support we have that need to be addressed.

Returning to increases among members of underrepresented groups participating in higher education, according to a recent Pew Research Center study directed by Paul Taylor:

“Freshman enrollment at the nation’s 6,100 post-secondary institutions surged by 144,000 students from the fall of 2007 to the fall of 2008. This 6 percent increase was the largest in 40 years, and almost three-quarters of it came from minority freshman enrollment growth.

From 2007 to 2008 (the first year of the recession), the freshman enrollment of Hispanics at postsecondary institutions grew by 15%, of blacks by 8%, Asians by 6% and whites by 3%.” (p.1)

Most of the first-year enrollment increases, however, took place in two-year institutions and private for-profit institutions (p.4).¹

Nonetheless, in February 2012, Emma Roller reported for The Chronicle that new census data revealed upward trends for members of underrepresented groups completing their BA degrees. Thus, “[f]rom 2001 to 2011, the number of Hispanics 25 and over with a bachelor’s degree or higher rose by 80 percent, the figures show. Among blacks, the increase was 47 percent, and among non-Hispanic whites, it was 24 percent” (p. 1).

During the period of expansion, percentages of international students as well as domestic minority students essentially remained flat at Clark. Thus, in 2007-08, with 1,884 women (59%) and 1,326 men (41%) and in 2008-09, with 2,013 women (59%) and 1,403 men (41%), Clark’s total international and

¹ Likewise, more youth have been completing high school, with a 29% increase from October 2007 to October 2008 (Taylor, p. 8).
domestic minority enrollment figures were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th></th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>(16%)</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>(19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic American</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>1,893</td>
<td>(59%)</td>
<td>2,053</td>
<td>(60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared Ethnicity</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>(17%)</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>(13%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In comparison, for this year, 2011-12, with 2,015 women (58%) and 1,447 men (42%), our minority enrollment figures appear to have improved only slightly (the Undeclared Ethnicity figure dropped again, making the determination inexact):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th></th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>(21%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic American</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>(2%, not available for 2007-08 and 2008-09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>1,981</td>
<td>(57%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared Ethnicity</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Striking is the similarity to figures provided by the Affirmative Action Office in 1989-90, for Fall 1989 (University Reports and Planning Documents, Confidential Box F 13-1-2, File: Reconceptualization of the Clark University Affirmative Action Office, 1989-1990):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1989</th>
<th></th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic American</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Appendices 5a-5e for reports over the last five years.

In comparison externally, as reported in The Chronicle’s Almanac of Higher Education 2011, other 4-year colleges in Fall 2010 (a year earlier) reported higher first-year enrollments than Clark’s in all similar categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American/black</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American/Asian</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-American/Chicano</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Latino</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska native</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Puerto Rican 1.6%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 1.0%

There is only a modest increase in faculty diversity at Clark as well. As reported in 2005, in our NEASC Self-Study Report (see below), for our 171 full-time faculty, Clark reported these numbers for the following underrepresented groups:

- Asian: 19 (11%)
- Black: 3 (1.7%)
- Hispanic: 1 (.6%)

Recent figures provided by Jeff Himmelberger suggest that there has been modest improvement in recruiting full-time faculty diversely:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>25 (12.6%)</td>
<td>28 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7 (3.5%)</td>
<td>8 (3.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>10 (5%)</td>
<td>12 (5.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the comment directly following the NEASC Self-Study’s 2005 figures mirrors the DIVTF’s assessment today: “While there is more diversity in the Clark full-time faculty today than ten years ago, we are not satisfied with the current number of faculty of color and it is a priority of the University to increase the diversity of the faculty” (p. 68).

Although we do not have comparative figures for Full-Time Staff, here is how the same groups are recently represented at Clark.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>11 (2.7%)</td>
<td>11 (2.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12 (2.9%)</td>
<td>13 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>29 (7.1%)</td>
<td>30 (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more detail on faculty and staff employment figures for 2010 and 2011, see Appendix 6.

Despite the very modest increases in diversity across the campus, we have the opportunity at this time, if we configure our diversity and inclusion measures effectively, to attract excellent and diverse students, faculty, and staff who can contribute, as Scott E. Page argued, to a stronger and more productive community (Patton, pp. 3-4).

**Brief Overview of Comparable Universities’ Efforts to Implement Diversity**

**Process**

In order to determine a base for comparison, various databases were reviewed. Again here, due to the nature of the search engines, a more limited approach to diversity and inclusion narrowed the results.
First, using data provided by the IPEDS Data Center, IES Institute of Education Sciences, four deliberately general variables were selected:

- Frequently used/ Derived variables-revised (2009-10)
  - Total cost of attendance, by residency and housing status
  - Total price for in-state student living on campus, Total price for out-of-state student living on campus
- Fall Enrollment, Estimated enrollment, total (F10)
- Finance, Tuition and Fees- total (2008-09).

Then, Clark was set as the comparison institution, and additional criteria were selected:

- State or other jurisdiction = all 50 states
- Sector = Private not-for-profit, 4-year or above
- Degree of urbanization = City: Midsize
- Institution size category = 1,000-4,999

At this point, the following diversity characteristics were selected:

- Institutional Characteristics-revised: UG with disabilities (2009-10)
- Fall Enrollment: Race/ethnicity, gender, attendance status, and level of student (F09)

With these variables, 75 institutions emerged.

Data provided by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching were then accessed. Clark was selected as a base, and various sets of variables were established for comparison:

- 3 variables = 25 results
  - 4 year or above
  - Private not-for-profit
  - Research university, high research activity

- 3 variables-a = 19 results
  - Private not-for-profit
  - Comprehensive PhD, no med, no veterinary
  - Full-time 4-year, more selective, lower transfer-in

- 3 variables-b = 16 results
  - Private not-for-profit
  - Majority undergraduate
  - Research university, high research activity

- 4 variables = 2 results, Clark and Bryn Mawr
  - 4 year or above
  - Private not-for-profit
  - Arts and sciences, some graduate coexistence
  - Comprehensive PhD, no med, no veterinary
Eventually, by comparing these results with those of IPEDS, the list was reduced to 36 colleges that were spread across the US. Peterson’s was consulted to gather relevant data, as were all institutions’ websites.

**Northeast:**
- Trinity College, Hartford CT
- Yale University, New Haven CT
- Boston College, Chestnut Hill MA
- Harvard University, Cambridge MA
- College of the Holy Cross, Worcester MA
- Northeastern University, Boston MA
- Fordham University, Bronx NY
- University of Rochester, NY
- Syracuse University, NY
- Bryn Mawr, PA
- Drexel University, Philadelphia PA
- Duquesne University, Pittsburgh PA
- Brown University, Providence RI
- Rhode Island School of Design, Providence

**Midwest:**
- Southern Methodist University, Fort Worth TX
- University of Dallas, Irving TX
- University of Richmond, VA
- Loyola University Chicago, IL
- St. John’s College, Springfield IL
- Drake University, Des Moines IA
- Augustana College, Sioux Falls SD
- Concordia University-Ann Arbor, MI
- Saint Louis University-Main Campus, MO
- University of Dayton, OH
- Edgewood College, Madison WI

**South:**
- Trinity has a Multicultural Affairs Office and a Dean of Multicultural Affairs.
- Duke University, Durham NC
- Salem College, Winston Salem NC
- Wake Forest University, Winston Salem NC
- Columbia College, Columbia SC
- Baylor University, Waco TX

**West:**
- Southern Methodist University, Fort Worth TX
- University of Dallas, Irving TX
- University of Richmond, VA
- Loyola University Chicago, IL
- St. John’s College, Springfield IL
- Drake University, Des Moines IA
- Augustana College, Sioux Falls SD
- Concordia University-Ann Arbor, MI
- Saint Louis University-Main Campus, MO
- University of Dayton, OH
- Edgewood College, Madison WI

Finally, this list of 36 institutions was pared down to 14, whose characteristics were closest in most categories to Clark (see Appendix 7).

**Structures at Other Institutions**
As may be expected, there is no single structure prevailing among these 14 institutions. Of course, since information taken from websites provides only a partial picture, no clear assessment of how effective their diversity measures are could be made. Nonetheless, the websites convey information on diversity efforts and administrators that proved useful.

**Administrative Structures**
- **Boston College** has an Office for Institutional Diversity with an Executive Director.
- **Brown** has an Office of Institutional Diversity, with an Associate Provost and Director.
- **Drexel** has an Office of Equality and Diversity, with an Associate Vice President.
- **Holy Cross** has an Office of Multicultural Education, with an Assistant Dean of Students and Director of Multicultural Education. They are searching for a Chief Diversity Officer.
- **Northeastern** has an Office of Institutional Diversity and Equity.
- **Rhode Island School of Design** locates diversity under STUDENTS.
- **Syracuse** locates diversity under HUMAN RESOURCES, and information is sparse and highly disparate.
- **Trinity** has a Multicultural Affairs Office and a Dean of Multicultural Affairs.
Richmond has an office called Common Ground, with a Director and Assistant Director. Southern Methodist University disperses information in user-unfriendly manner; under "multicultural," a list of diversity organizations appear under STUDENT AFFAIRS. Loyola has a Student Diversity and Multicultural Affairs Office, which appears as a division of Student Development. Saint Louis University has an Office of Diversity and Affirmative Action. The University of Denver locates diversity on the Chancellor’s website and has a Center for Multicultural Excellence. The University of Puget Sound has a Chief Diversity Officer.

Observations
While quality and organization differed among these institutions’ website presentations, the following proved interesting for our own deliberations:

- As represented on the websites, diversity was most commonly directed at students, perhaps with the intent to attract more diverse students, as conveyed in the relatively sparse information provided by the Holy Cross, Loyola University Chicago, RISD, Southern Methodist University, and Trinity University websites, and more fully by the University of Puget Sound and University of Richmond websites.
- Most of the websites give weight to diversity by presenting a separate, full set of information about diversity at the institution. Boston College’s website, for example, includes a mission statement, information about the office, a list of seven strategic initiatives, a message from the Executive Director, Programs, Resources, a Calendar of Events, and Policies.
- Brown and the University of Denver additionally include documents on their websites with regards to diversity initiatives along with status reports on actions needed and taken. In these reports, it seems clear that Brown and Denver attempt to cultivate diversity at every level. Perhaps of interest to us, the University of Denver operates through what they term Inclusive Excellence. They have four overarching goals to effect inclusive excellence, as articulated in March 2011:
  - Building a diverse community
  - Creating a supportive climate for diversity
  - Structuring for change
  - Serving the public good by positively effecting diversity beyond the university
- Some institutions seem to place responsibility for diversity measures on human resources, as suggested by the Northeastern University, Saint Louis University, and Syracuse University websites.

Clark’s 2001 ad hoc Task Force on Diversity
In 2000-01, an ad hoc Task Force on Diversity was convened by President John Bassett, comprising: Doug Little (Dean of the College and Chair), Hadley Camilus (undergraduate), Pat Derr (Philosophy), Beverly Grier (Government), Miguelina Hernandez (Assistant Director of Admissions), July Joy (Undergraduate), Chris Landee (Physics), and Lisa Moore (Director of the Multicultural Center).

On 29 May 2001, John Bassett summarized the results in a memo to the Task Force, focusing on these elements:
- Clark needs to be more proactive in seeking new tenure-track faculty from underrepresented groups, especially with respect to African Americans.
• In regards to our students, Clark needs to do more to add to the numbers of minorities entering professional careers.
• Clark must also seek staff members from underrepresented groups more aggressively, in part by creating solid regional networks and better connections with Worcester ethnic communities.
• The Task Force was divided on the issue of hiring an Affirmative Action Officer.
• A committee on campus climate should be established, although a standing committee may present a problem.
• The Race and Ethnic Relations concentration should be retained, but the issue of creating a free-standing African-American Studies program should be re-visited.
• Finally, admissions efforts need to be improved.

The 2005 Ten-Year and 2010 Fifth Year Reports to NEASC
In compliance with standard procedures of the New England Association of Schools and College (NEASC), Clark submitted a Ten-Year Self-Study in 2005, and an interim report on progress toward stated goals in 2010.

The 2005 Ten-Year Report
With respect to the 2005 Self-Study, one of our signatures was identified as, “Experience Diverse Cultures,’ and focused on “Clark’s commitment to integrate the richness of many cultures into campus life and the student academic experience” (p. 28). Citing the International Studies Stream and Global Perspective, international research, and the percentage of international students at Clark as indices of this commitment, the self-study identifies one of its goals as increasing the number of undergraduates studying abroad, thereby articulating an international focus on diversity and inclusion as an exchange, a conversation, by building on one of our traditional strengths.

Moreover, with respect to incoming undergraduates, “we also seek to maintain diversity within the enrolling class, a reasonable gender ratio, and a broad distribution of student academic and co-curricular interests. In the enrolling class of all 2004, 14.4 percent of students self-identified as students of color and 8.3 percent were international students” (p. 59; cf. 78-79). Later, the self-study adds that while numbers and the mix of international students recruited to Clark progress, “[w]e are concerned about our capability to enroll sufficient domestic students of color to achieve our goals for diversity of the student body” (p. 62). Thus, one goal articulated with respect to domestic diversity was to “[a]chieve a yield for ALANA students equivalent to the yield for the incoming class as a whole (from 2-3 percent below the average yield of the incoming class). The University will develop in 2005-06 a revised plan for recruiting and enrolling ALANA students.” Likewise, the Self-Study asserts, among various desiderata, the goal of “[e]xpanding the diversity of the faculty [and staff] by ...hiring more faculty and staff of color” (pp. 75-76).

The report noted as well that, “Clark does not offer a structured disabilities program or comprehensive services for students with disabilities,” reporting modest improvements, as for example, with “assistive technology,” while reporting “Clark’s policy is to make all spaces accessible as we renovate old buildings and build new ones” (p. 81). It is instructive that learning and physical disabilities are treated within the same section, reflecting the dearth of support
currently characterizing our services, with one full-time and one part-time employee in charge of students with all disabilities. Currently, Clark has 247 students with documented cases of disabilities.

**NEASC’s Response**
In its 2006 Response to the Self-Study, NEASC writes that Clark, among other things, should “give special attention to ensuring its success in...achieving the University’s own goals for diversity of students, faculty, and staff” (p. 1), noting our own dissatisfaction with our results in the attempt to create a more diverse campus (p.4)

**The 2010 Interim Report**
In the 2010 Fifth-Year Report, Clark notes modest success in recruiting faculty diversely, as reported above, and in total undergraduate enrollments of underrepresented groups increasing from 10 to 12 percent. Improvements in ALANA student services were reported (p. 31), while services for students with disabilities appears to have remained the same (p. 32). Likewise, “[t]he Board has recognized the importance of greater diversification of its members and has pointedly moved to address this issue since 2005...recogniz[ing] that more work needs to be done to attract women as trustees” (p. 17). The 2010 Report notes as well that from 2005 to 2010, the percentage of women faculty increased from 35% to 43%, to conclude, “While we have made some progress in increasing the diversity of the faculty since our 2005 NEASC report, we still are not satisfied with our efforts, and increasing faculty diversity remains one of our top priorities” (p. 25).

**Clark’s 2006-09 Diversity Committee**
In 2006-09, a committee comprising faculty and staff was convened by then Provost David Angel to address diversity issues. Meeting monthly, but hindered by a variety of circumstances, the meetings spurred action as well as an uncirculated Diversity Action Plan authored by Ravi Perry and endorsed by faculty members Esther Jones, Shelly Tenenbaum, Toby Sisson, and Janette Greenwood along with staff members Wes Gadson, Amy Daly Gardner, and Mounira Morris.

Although interviewed Diversity Committee members expressed frustration at the lack of coherent action, general goals were articulated, some concrete suggestions were made, and improvements were effected.

**Goals**
Three primary goals as listed below were articulated, of which the first was most successful:

- To enhance communication between the administration and students
- To establish benchmarks for progress
- To establish priorities

**Suggestions**
Suggested measures were aimed mainly at improving diversity among students:

- Each ethnic or racial group should have its own administrative representation.
- Clark should have more courses in ethnic and racial studies or signature courses.
- Clark should continue to invest in intercultural programs.
Clark should hire more diverse faculty and staff members.

**Results**

Although not all goals and measures were effected, staff members were able to enhance communication between the administration and students through a significant variety of measures:

- Training sessions were held.
- Some intercultural events, as, e.g., for Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, were improved.
- The Millennial Leadership Conference has been operated at a particularly high level as an empowering event.
- As mentioned above, Articulation Agreements with two-year colleges that seek to attract qualified students to Clark, a significant number of them belonging to underrepresented groups, have been initiated and are in progress.
- A protocol for Bias and Hate Incidents, available in the Student Handbook, was established (see Appendix 8). Subsequently, a Bias Response Team (Amy Daly Gardner, Mounira Morris, and Jason Zelensky) was created.

**Diversity Task Force 2011-12: Surveys**

The Diversity Task Force 2011-12 decided that to obtain a more accurate sense of the campus climate, we would need to survey the staff, faculty, and students. To that end, Esteban Cardemil created 3 surveys that were approved by IRB, administered over the internet, and evaluated with the assistance of Michael Krikonis of ITS (see Appendices 9a-9c for the survey forms). While one faculty member felt the questions were too complex to respond to in the manner provided, a staff member provided us with the feedback that it made him think about his own privileged status and hence become more conscious of diversity and inclusion matters.

**Overview**

As part of the DIVTF’s efforts this year to conduct a preliminary assessment of campus climate as it pertains to diversity and inclusion, the DIVTF created and administered a brief online survey. Drawing on some relevant literature, the DIVTF developed three similar surveys for students, faculty, and staff to complete. The confidential survey consisted of 14-16 items (depending on the version) that asked participants to provide their perspective on Clark’s:

1. general attitude towards people from diverse backgrounds,
2. efforts to integrate issues of diversity into the educational curriculum, extracurricular activities, and work-life of its constituents, and
3. diversity among the student, faculty, and staff.

Several items focused on inclusion, on participants’ personal experiences, including:

1. degree of comfort being oneself when interacting with others,
2. experiences with offensive or hostile remarks around issues of diversity, and
3. social interactions with individuals from different backgrounds.
Each of the items asked specifically about a particular dimension of diversity (i.e., race/ethnicity, national origin, sex/gender, sexual orientation, ability/disability, religion, political orientation) and was rated on a 4-point Likert scale (see Figure 1 below). Higher scores are associated with more positive outcomes (e.g., more welcoming attitude, fewer negative experiences). Note that scores for items 9, 10, and 11 were reverse-scored to maintain overall consistency of valence.

At the end of the survey, participants were asked open-ended questions about how they self-identify along each of the dimensions of diversity. These open-ended questions were (partially) coded in order to facilitate quantitative analyses.

Figure 1: Question 1 from the DIVTF 2012 Survey on Campus Climate

1. In general, Clark University is welcoming to people of different:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racial or ethnic backgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National origins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual identity or orientations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilities or disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious backgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political orientations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of the number of questions (n=14-16) and the number of dimensions subsumed in each question (n=7), the data were combined in two ways to facilitate interpretation. First, all of the dimension scores within each item were used to create a mean item score. Thus, for Question 1 above, the scores for each of the seven dimensions were summed and divided by seven, creating a Q1 Mean Total Score. This process created 13 Mean Total Question scores, which we present below. Second, all of the dimension scores across items were used to create a mean dimension score. For example, the scores for each of the Racial or Ethnic backgrounds item were summed across all of the questions and then divided by the total number of questions. This process created 7 Mean Total Dimension scores, which we also present below.

**Procedure**

All Clark students, faculty, and staff were invited via e-mail to complete the survey. In the invitation, potential participants were given a brief description of the purpose of the survey, the estimated length

---

2 Unfortunately, an error in the editing process led to the inadvertent removal of the dimension of socioeconomic status.
of time to complete the survey, an assurance of the voluntary nature of participation, and a notice that the survey was confidential in nature. Participants were also informed that Clark’s IRB had approved the survey. The e-mail invitation contained a hyperlink to the survey website, allowing interested participants to connect directly from the e-mail. After one week, all students, faculty, and staff who had not completed the survey were sent a second request to participate. The online site was open to participants for 10 days and then closed for data entry.

**Results**

In total, 361 students, 72 faculty, and 95 staff members completed the survey. Overall, participants endorsed a generally positive view of the campus climate. As can be seen from Tables 1 and 2 below, the average scores were around 3 (on a scale of 1-4). This score roughly corresponded with “Agree” and “Satisfied.” For Q9, Q10, and Q11, the scoring is reversed, however, so that higher scores are associated with less experience with insensitive, intolerant, or derogatory comments.

Important differences emerged among students, faculty, and staff in perceptions of campus climate. In general, faculty tended to rate Clark less favorably on most of the questions than students or staff. These ratings differences were statistically significant for Q2, Q4, Q5, Q7, and Q12. As compared with faculty and staff, students reported significantly more experiences with insensitive, intolerant, or derogatory comments from other students. As compared with faculty and students, staff reported significantly more experiences with insensitive, intolerant, or derogatory comments from other staff.

Table 1: Mean Total Question scores, with participant status comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Sig Diff*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. In general, Clark University is welcoming to people of different...</td>
<td>3.24 (0.52) N=499</td>
<td>3.24 (0.50) N=348</td>
<td>3.16 (0.59) N=61</td>
<td>3.28 (0.57) N=90</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Clark University promotes the understanding of differences...</td>
<td>3.11 (0.58) N=496</td>
<td>3.11 (0.57) N=351</td>
<td>2.93 (0.66) N=59</td>
<td>3.24 (0.55) N=86</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Clark University effectively integrates issues of diversity into the educational curriculum...</td>
<td>2.92 (0.58) N=393</td>
<td>2.94 (0.56) N=337</td>
<td>2.79 (0.70) N=56</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Clark University effectively considers issues of diversity in faculty work life...</td>
<td>3.02 (0.64) N=476</td>
<td>3.09 (0.58) N=337</td>
<td>2.72 (0.84) N=55</td>
<td>2.94 (0.65) N=84</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. How satisfied are you with the diversity of the current student body...</td>
<td>3.01 (0.56) N=482</td>
<td>3.03 (0.55) N=347</td>
<td>2.81 (0.63) N=50</td>
<td>3.02 (0.53) N=85</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. How satisfied are you with the diversity of the current faculty...</td>
<td>2.98 (0.60) N=464</td>
<td>3.01 (0.59) N=337</td>
<td>2.82 (0.74) N=45</td>
<td>2.93 (0.56) N=82</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. How satisfied are you with the diversity of the staff...</td>
<td>3.02 (0.58) N=471</td>
<td>3.08 (0.58) N=332</td>
<td>2.85 (0.59) N=56</td>
<td>2.88 (0.50) N=83</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. In general, I feel that I can be myself while interacting with:</td>
<td>3.23 (0.65) N=506</td>
<td>3.26 (0.63) N=350</td>
<td>3.22 (0.80) N=65</td>
<td>3.12 (0.60) N=91</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9. I have experienced or witnessed students making insensitive, intolerant, or derogatory comments... (REVERSED)</td>
<td>3.19 (0.76) N=504</td>
<td>2.98 (0.75) N=351</td>
<td>3.63 (0.55) N=65</td>
<td>3.73 (0.50) N=88</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10. I have experienced or witnessed faculty making insensitive, intolerant, or derogatory comments... (REVERSED)</td>
<td>3.69 (0.52) N=500</td>
<td>3.71 (0.50) N=350</td>
<td>3.60 (0.64) N=62</td>
<td>3.70 (0.51) N=88</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11. I have experienced or witnessed staff making insensitive, intolerant, or derogatory comments... (REVERSED)</td>
<td>3.75 (0.50) N=494</td>
<td>3.83 (0.43) N=345</td>
<td>3.80 (0.41) N=58</td>
<td>3.49 (0.66) N=91</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12. How often do you socialize outside of work with students/faculty/staff who are different from you...</td>
<td>3.25 (0.58) N=492</td>
<td>3.32 (0.50) N=349</td>
<td>2.84 (0.77) N=58</td>
<td>3.21 (0.61) N=61</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13. How often do you interact in your courses with students who are different from you...</td>
<td>3.35 (0.60) N=343</td>
<td>3.35 (0.60) N=343</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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*ANOVAs were conducted with participant status (i.e., student, faculty, staff) as the classification variable. Yes indicates a statistically significant difference ($p < 0.05$) across the three groups of participants. The total is provided as a comparison and was not used in the statistical analyses.

Similar results emerged for the Mean Dimension scores. Faculty tended to provide lower (worse) ratings for all of the dimensions, while students tended to provide the highest (best) ratings. The differences across the three groups emerged as statistically significant for Race/Ethnicity, National Origin, Sexual Orientation, and Political Orientation.

Table 2: Mean Dimension scores, with participant status comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Sig Diff?*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>3.25 (0.50)</td>
<td>3.29 (0.46)</td>
<td>2.99 (0.65)</td>
<td>3.18 (0.53)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=452</td>
<td>N=328</td>
<td>N=43</td>
<td>N=81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Origin</td>
<td>3.33 (0.44)</td>
<td>3.38 (0.42)</td>
<td>3.15 (0.54)</td>
<td>3.25 (0.46)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=445</td>
<td>N=323</td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>N=81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex/Gender</td>
<td>3.38 (0.41)</td>
<td>3.40 (0.40)</td>
<td>3.29 (0.48)</td>
<td>3.35 (0.41)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=437</td>
<td>N=314</td>
<td>N=45</td>
<td>N=78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>3.33 (0.44)</td>
<td>3.37 (0.41)</td>
<td>3.17 (0.55)</td>
<td>3.27 (0.43)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=438</td>
<td>N=319</td>
<td>N=41</td>
<td>N=78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability/Disability</td>
<td>3.13 (0.50)</td>
<td>3.15 (0.47)</td>
<td>2.98 (0.61)</td>
<td>3.12 (0.51)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=432</td>
<td>N=311</td>
<td>N=40</td>
<td>N=81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>3.22 (0.47)</td>
<td>3.20 (0.47)</td>
<td>3.19 (0.52)</td>
<td>3.30 (0.42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=428</td>
<td>N=314</td>
<td>N=39</td>
<td>N=75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation</td>
<td>2.95 (0.55)</td>
<td>2.91 (0.54)</td>
<td>2.89 (0.61)</td>
<td>3.14 (0.53)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=419</td>
<td>N=310</td>
<td>N=35</td>
<td>N=74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ANOVAs were conducted with participant status (i.e., student, faculty, staff) as the classification variable. Yes indicates a statistically significant difference ($p < 0.05$) across the three groups of participants. The total is provided as a comparison and was not used in the statistical analyses.

Due to time limitations, only two other subgroup analyses were conducted. The first examined the extent to which participant responses differed by racial or ethnic status. Due to the low numbers of participants from many of the racial and ethnic groups, we made the decision to create two primary groups.

The first group consisted of participants who self-identified as white/European American or European origin and/or descent. Of note, this group included domestic and international participants.

The second group consisted of participants who self identified as persons of color (e.g., African, African American, Caribbean American, Latino, Asian or Asian American, American Indian) or who self-identified as multi-racial. As with the first group, this group also included domestic and international participants.

As Tables 3 and 4 below demonstrate, a consistent pattern emerged whereby participants who self-identified as persons of color reported lower ratings than participants who self-identified as white (American and international). This pattern was statistically significant across a number of items and dimensions as indicated below.
Table 3: Mean Total Question scores, with participant race/ethnicity comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White (US + Int’l)</th>
<th>People of Color (US + Intl)</th>
<th>Sig Diff?*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. In general, Clark University is welcoming to people of different...</td>
<td>3.24 (0.52)</td>
<td>3.28 (0.47)</td>
<td>3.17 (0.56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=499</td>
<td>N=293</td>
<td>N=100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Clark University promotes the understanding of differences...</td>
<td>3.11 (0.58)</td>
<td>3.17 (0.55)</td>
<td>2.99 (0.61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=496</td>
<td>N=295</td>
<td>N=100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Clark effectively integrates issues of dive into the educational curriculum...</td>
<td>2.92 (0.58)</td>
<td>2.97 (0.52)</td>
<td>2.76 (0.62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=393</td>
<td>N=233</td>
<td>N=82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Clark University effectively considers issues of diversity in faculty work life...</td>
<td>3.02 (0.64)</td>
<td>3.08 (0.58)</td>
<td>2.92 (0.70)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=476</td>
<td>N=277</td>
<td>N=95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. How satisfied are you with the diversity of the current student body...</td>
<td>3.01 (0.56)</td>
<td>3.05 (0.51)</td>
<td>2.89 (0.58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=482</td>
<td>N=279</td>
<td>N=100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. How satisfied are you with the diversity of the current faculty...</td>
<td>2.98 (0.60)</td>
<td>3.00 (0.55)</td>
<td>2.80 (0.67)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=464</td>
<td>N=270</td>
<td>N=94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. How satisfied are you with the diversity of the staff...</td>
<td>3.02 (0.58)</td>
<td>3.06 (0.54)</td>
<td>2.91 (0.66)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=471</td>
<td>N=272</td>
<td>N=97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. In general, I feel that I can be myself while interacting with:</td>
<td>3.23 (0.65)</td>
<td>3.33 (0.60)</td>
<td>3.10 (0.70)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=506</td>
<td>N=295</td>
<td>N=102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9. I have experienced or witnessed students making insensitive, intolerant, or derogatory comments... (REVERSED)</td>
<td>3.19 (0.76)</td>
<td>3.23 (0.73)</td>
<td>2.96 (0.80)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=504</td>
<td>N=292</td>
<td>N=101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10. I have experienced or witnessed faculty making insensitive, intolerant, or derogatory comments... (REVERSED)</td>
<td>3.69 (0.52)</td>
<td>3.75 (0.40)</td>
<td>3.56 (0.65)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=500</td>
<td>N=294</td>
<td>N=101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11. I have experienced or witnessed staff making insensitive, intolerant, or derogatory comments... (REVERSED)</td>
<td>3.75 (0.50)</td>
<td>3.82 (0.41)</td>
<td>3.70 (0.56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=494</td>
<td>N=287</td>
<td>N=100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12. How often do you socialize outside of work with students/faculty/staff who are different from you...</td>
<td>3.25 (0.58)</td>
<td>3.23 (0.50)</td>
<td>3.42 (0.51)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=492</td>
<td>N=292</td>
<td>N=99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13. How often do you interact in your courses with students who are different from you...</td>
<td>3.35 (0.60)</td>
<td>3.41 (0.46)</td>
<td>3.45 (0.51)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=343</td>
<td>N=204</td>
<td>N=76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*T-tests were conducted with participant race/ethnicity (i.e., white, people of color) as the classification variable. Yes indicates a statistically significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between the two groups. The total is provided as a comparison and was not used in the statistical analyses.

Table 4: Mean Total Question scores, with participant race/ethnicity comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White (US + Int’l)</th>
<th>People of Color (US + Intl)</th>
<th>Sig Diff?*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>3.25 (0.50)</td>
<td>3.31 (0.43)</td>
<td>3.08 (0.53)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=452</td>
<td>N=266</td>
<td>N=92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Origin</td>
<td>3.33 (0.44)</td>
<td>3.41 (0.36)</td>
<td>3.20 (0.47)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=445</td>
<td>N=261</td>
<td>N=90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex/Gender</td>
<td>3.38 (0.41)</td>
<td>3.43 (0.36)</td>
<td>3.30 (0.43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=437</td>
<td>N=260</td>
<td>N=87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>3.33 (0.44)</td>
<td>3.40 (0.40)</td>
<td>3.22 (0.47)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=438</td>
<td>N=258</td>
<td>N=89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability/Disability</td>
<td>3.13 (0.50)</td>
<td>3.13 (0.48)</td>
<td>3.07 (0.51)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=432</td>
<td>N=255</td>
<td>N=85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>3.22 (0.47)</td>
<td>3.23 (0.42)</td>
<td>3.12 (0.50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=428</td>
<td>N=252</td>
<td>N=87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation</td>
<td>2.95 (0.55)</td>
<td>2.92 (0.54)</td>
<td>2.99 (0.52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=419</td>
<td>N=249</td>
<td>N=86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*T-tests were conducted with participant race/ethnicity (i.e., white, people of color) as the classification variable. Yes indicates a statistically significant difference (p < 0.05) between the two groups. The total is provided as a comparison and was not used in the statistical analyses.

The second subgroup analysis conducted focused on sex/gender. Unlike the results from the two prior analyses, sex/gender did not emerge as a consistent predictor of differences. Among the Mean Total Questions scores, two questions yielded significant results. On both Q10 (I have experienced or witnessed faculty making insensitive, intolerant, or derogatory comments...) and Q11 (I have experienced or witnessed staff making insensitive, intolerant, or derogatory comments...), male participants reported more frequent experiences [Q10: 3.75 (SD=0.43) vs. 3.61 (SD=0.57); Q11: 3.84 (SD=0.39) vs. 3.69 (SD=0.56)]. None of the sex/gender differences in dimensions were statistically significant.

**Limitations of the Survey**

It is important to recognize the limitations of this survey.

First, only a subset of Clark participants completed the surveys. To represent the range of perspectives on Clark’s campus accurately, it will be important to find ways to increase the participation of its different constituents.

Second, it is not possible to know to what extent participants were completing the surveys honestly and thoughtfully.

Third, we did not gather important identifying information that could clarify some of the findings. For example, we did not distinguish between undergraduate and graduate students, between tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty, or between exempt and non-exempt staff. Likewise, we did not gather information about majors or departments, which could have added more useful information.

**General Conclusions**

Despite the limitations, the survey has provided us with useful information. In particular, the results are broadly consistent with the different group meetings and discussions that the DIVTF has held with departments, committees, and individuals, suggesting that diversity and inclusion efforts need to be improved and become an integral part of our framework.

Thus, there is some evidence that individuals from racial or ethnic minority backgrounds hold less favorable views than individuals of white/European American backgrounds regarding Clark’s efforts to address diversity issues. The size of the effects were in the moderate range, indicating that the differences were not minor. The differences were also not exceedingly large, suggesting some optimism that with increased attention to these issues, positive progress may be possible.

It is our recommendation that Clark University regularly assess campus climate with an instrument similar to, or preferably better than, the instrument used in this initial survey. Regular assessment is an important step towards identifying particular areas requiring attention and then moving forward towards developing and implementing solutions. Future surveys, of course, will adjust or supplement the questions that were posed this year, as needs require.
The administering of this and future surveys, then, serves minimally two purposes:
- to assess at a given point in time what attitudes towards diversity and inclusion prevail on campus, and
- to serve as a reminder that we need to be vigilant with respect to our campus culture.

**Priming the Pump**
While results have been slow and, as indicated in the NEASC self-studies, disappointing, they could just as well be seen as priming the pump for establishing diversity and inclusion not only as a critical priority, but also as a defining framework of our campus culture. With the experiences of many universities that have hired chief diversity officers, Clark can proceed with confidence that the establishing of a diversity and inclusion team can produce the desired results (cf. Arnold and Kowalski-Braun, Williams and Wade-Golden).

**Diversity Task Force Recommendations**
After reviewing a variety of materials, conducting meetings, and assessing survey data, we have arrived at the following recommendations. As Mark Winston and Haipeng Li confirm in researching how vice-presidents for academic affairs and academic deans in liberal arts college assess diversity as an institutional priority, “Recent research involving issues of diversity and equity in organizations has highlighted the proven connection between investment in diversity and organizational success and performance” (p.1).

Returning for a moment to the April 2011 iteration of Clark’s *Academic and Financial Plan*, it may prove useful to recall the three measures mandated by the faculty:
1. Diversify the campus, and the faculty in particular.
2. Establish a Task Force that would assess the campus climate and emerge with concrete recommendations.
3. Provide programming focusing on diversity.

If Clark is to create a diverse and inclusive community that enriches the campus culture, it is important to address structural issues so that we do not lapse into ‘benign neglect.’ Not only will Clark benefit from such structural changes, but, in line with Clark’s motto and LEEP’s intent to instantiate liberal arts principles into practice, so too will communities associated with Clark, both locally and internationally.

**Establishing an Administrative Structure**
The DIVTF most strongly recommends that we establish a central office to focus efforts aimed at enhancing our campus climate, which could be called the *University Office of Diversity and Inclusion*. The office would be led by a faculty member, who would convene a standing *Committee for Diversity and Inclusion*, comprising representatives from staff, faculty, students, and the academic administration (perhaps *ex officio*). We recommend further that a *liaison between the University Office of Diversity and Inclusion and Clark’s Board of Trustees* be established through a Board staff member serving on the Board’s Social Responsibility Committee, who, in conjunction with Clark’s diversity leader, would ensure
that progress reports become a standing item at Board meetings, a suggestion originating from Mark Tigan (IDCE).

The University Office of Diversity and Inclusion
As has been remarked many times during the course of our meetings and research, the importance of place to establish a presence cannot be underestimated. Indeed, alumna and lawyer Corine K. Claxton recently conveyed to us in an e-mail, “During the BSU event it seemed as if the students really needed a platform to discuss their concerns. Clark may be able to improve the climate by continuing to provide a safe space for the students to talk with each other, with administrators and with the faculty about issues involving diversity ...”

While the University Office of Diversity and Inclusion should serve as the hub for all 3 constituencies, importantly, it will also serve as Clark’s ‘calling card’ externally.

Over time, the Clark faculty member leading this Office will determine its major functions, but we recommend that, minimally, a diversity and inclusion library be housed in this Office, that it be handicapped-accessible, and that it be in a central location.

Leading the University Office of Diversity and Inclusion
In order to ensure that we do not lapse into ‘benign neglect,’ crucial to our recommendations is that a faculty member lead the University Office of Diversity and Inclusion.

What the individual should be called has not been determined. The titles that emerged at the top of the list are:

Director of the University Office of Diversity and Inclusion: This title allows for the supervision of all matters pertaining to diversity and inclusion, but through the term ‘Director,’ it suggests a marginalized post.

Associate Provost for Diversity and Inclusion: While this title recognizes the individual’s faculty membership through the term ‘provost,’ it neglects the two other constituencies of the office: staff and students.

Chief Officer for Diversity and Inclusion: Naming the faculty member a Chief Officer for Diversity and Inclusion would be consonant with other titles in the administration and, more importantly, it echoes the most common name for this post at other universities.

While the title is likely to be determined by the President and the appointed individual, for purposes of this report, we will use the most common title, Chief Officer for Diversity and Inclusion (CODI).

Crucially, President David Angel has agreed to appointing a CODI, operating as a member of his office. This is a critical placement, since the CODI will work with faculty, staff, and students and thus will need to have an authorized voice that spans all constituencies. As Damon A. Williams and Katrina C. Wade-

---

3 Cf. Lipka’s article on the need for the GLBT community to have a secure space.
4 The most popular title seems to be ‘Chief Diversity Officer,’ but the DIVTF believes, as increasing numbers outside Clark also do, that inclusion is a critical part of the position.
Golden argue, “[c]hief diversity officers have responsibility for guiding efforts to conceptualize, define, assess, nurture, and cultivate diversity as an institutional and educational resource” (p. 2).

Consonant with Clark’s particular campus culture, ideally, the CODI will be a tenured faculty member. At Clark, faculty members shape policy and direction more immediately than at many, if not most, US institutions. Given this fact, along with all that the CODI needs to accomplish, a well-respected faculty member who is knowledgeable about Clark from the outset will enable him/her to implement fitting measures effectively.

The DIVTF further proposes that the CODI be appointed for 3-year, renewable terms. This allows not only for the possibility of others sharing in the continuing work that any campus needs to nourish, but also for any single CODI to continue with his/her scholarly career.

Since it is our most important priority to place a CODI in President Angel’s office, the DIVTF seeks to optimize the possibility of appointing a highly capable individual. Ultimately, of course, President Angel will make the selection. We recommend below our preferences for the appointment:

1. An internal appointment, tenured and at the mid-range level:
   A candidate meeting these qualifications is our best choice. S/He would have good knowledge of Clark, be secure in terms of her/his professional status at Clark, and be able to enrich her/his career through this position.

2a. An internal tenure-line appointment at the late pre-tenure stage:
   This is a precarious option for the individual, and one that the DIVTF is not comfortable with, so that the risks for her/his bid for tenure should be made plain to any individual at this career stage. This option is offered only because it is not known whether anyone at the mid-range will apply.

2b. An appointment stemming from an external search for a mid-level faculty member, who would begin at Clark with tenure:
   If funding and an expeditious, and effective, search for a highly qualified candidate seem to be a realistic possibility, this option would be preferable to 2a for obvious reasons.

3. An appointment stemming from a search for an administrator:
   While we believe that a faculty member would best serve the interests of diversity and inclusion at Clark, we do not wish to exclude the possibility, should all else fail, that an administrator of diversity and inclusion located in President Angel’s office may prove effective as well.

The Committee for Diversity and Inclusion
The work of the CODI will certainly benefit from hearing as many voices as possible and from consulting with a committee that can help her/him to effect significant, Clark-specific initiatives. We recommend that the Committee for Diversity and Inclusion comprise representatives from faculty, staff, and students.

The Board of Trustees and the Chief Officer for Diversity and Inclusion
The DIVTF further recommends that the CODI establish a strong relationship with Clark’s Board of Trustees, by working with a member of its Social Responsibility Committee, who will consult with the CODI and provide progress reports to the Board as a standing item.

**Job Description**

Given the current uncertainties involved in selecting the CODI, this job description aims only to convey the importance of the position.

The Chief Officer of Diversity and Inclusion (CODI) advances Clark University’s institutional priority of engaging and nurturing faculty, staff, students, and alumnae/i with a wide variety of backgrounds, perspectives, interests, abilities, and talents, while ensuring that the climate and conditions on campus promote diversity and inclusion.

The CODI will advise the President on all diversity and inclusion matters. S/He will lead a committee comprising members from the student body (both undergraduate and graduate), the staff, and the faculty. S/He will work with Clark’s Board of Trustees through a staff member serving on its Social Responsibility Committee, who, in conjunction with the CODI, will ensure that progress reports comprise a standing item at Board meetings.

The CODI will promote diversity and inclusion by means of a variety of tasks, including: periodically analyzing the campus climate (by means of meetings, interviews, and surveys); defining key areas in need of improvement and/or support along with conceptualizing new measures, as articulated in a concrete multi-year plan with goals and measures of success; initiating and organizing on-going instruction for faculty and staff; regularly reporting to the Clark community; and publicizing and promoting diversity and inclusion at Clark and externally, in part by means of establishing a wide range of networks and representing Clark in both internal and external venues.

It is thus imperative that the CODI collaborate with offices across campus and constituencies. Just as critically, the CODI should not only have or acquire in-depth knowledge of Clark as an institution in order to know how best and where to effect change, but s/he should also possess technical mastery of diversity and inclusion issues, the ability to work with various groups and constituencies, the imagination to create a synergistic vision, and the administrative ability to articulate and realize concrete measures for effecting that vision.

**Organizing and Implementing**

**Internal Diversity and Inclusion Work**

An important task for the CODI and the Committee for Diversity and Inclusion will be to have regular meetings with various administrative staff and faculty committees in order to gather information, discuss plans, and ensure that goals are implemented. It is equally important that the CODI keep the President informed, and gain support, on agreed-upon diversity and inclusion efforts.

Below follow activities that the DIVTF deem to be essential for the University Office for Diversity and Inclusion. Recalling the 2010 Five-Year Report for NEASC, as cited above, “While we have made some progress in increasing the diversity of the faculty since our 2005 NEASC report, we still are not satisfied with our efforts, and increasing faculty diversity remains one of our top priorities” (p. 25).
Centralizing:

While the sound of ‘centralizing’ may seem foreboding, centralizing can establish a presence and create synergy from disparately diffused elements, such as characterizes the current state of diversity and inclusion on Clark’s campus. Indeed, many Departments expressed the need for focus, as evidenced in the requests for centers that would provide more research interaction, better communication that would enable faculty and staff to understand more fully who their potential project partners could be, more social interaction, a safe place for underrepresented groups, and mentoring, among other suggestions. In other words, attempts to create synergy can be effectively accomplished through centralizing efforts, information, and groups.

• An overview should be created that takes into account current efforts, teaching, research, student clubs, and proposals promoting diversity and inclusion.
• Having such information at hand, the University Office for Diversity and Inclusion could then help those who wish to further diversity and inclusion.
  o In conjunction with Human Resources, the University Office for Diversity and Inclusion could provide assistance with hiring strategies for faculty and staff that would promote a diverse culture.
  o Again in conjunction with Human Resources, but also with UAB, the Office could provide examples of and/or workshops in the formulating of courses and pedagogical approaches that promote diversity and inclusion.
  o Likewise, the University Office for Diversity and Inclusion could work with departments to include diversity and inclusion measures in their 10-year plans.
  o Another service could be to provide information, contacts, and/or support for research in the field, as for example, in the area of engaged scholarship, historically framed archival work, or social scientific, aesthetic, or literary analyses.
  o In conjunction with Admissions, the Office could provide prospective applicants with information that may attract students from diverse backgrounds.
  o The University Office for Diversity and Inclusion could sponsor summer programs for high school students to help them make the transition to Clark; and
  o A fund could be established so that students who cannot afford them could buy books.
• The University Office for Diversity and Inclusion could also gather faculty, staff, and student grievances and suggestions in order to effect solutions where appropriate, such as the following which were conveyed to the DIVTF.
  o In order better to accommodate international visiting scholars, the CODI could work to re-open a guest house.
  o Strategies could be developed and implemented to engage more members of underrepresented groups in the academic administration and in a variety of offices across campus.
  o The question of whether Clark is truly diverse and inclusive, for example, with respect to political groups, could be pursued.
  o The stress on current members of underrepresented groups to mentor junior members of underrepresented groups needs to be recognized; currently, it is invisible work.
    ▪ COP has recommended that there be a category created on our annual evaluation forms for this purpose.
The Faculty Work Task Force has included the following language in a draft version of Part One:

Moreover, faculty of color, and members of other underrepresented groups (e.g., GLBTQ), may face particularly high demands on their time and resources as they serve as representatives for, and mentors to, students who self-identify with these groups. Department chairs and the Provost’s Office should recognize, appreciate, and account for this work as effectively as possible in order to balance workloads equitably within and between departments and to enable individuals to make significant contributions to the University’s strategic priorities...

- In similar vein, some staff members also observed that their work is not recognized and they seem invisible to faculty.
- The Office could examine the option of providing childcare options for parents, which might help retain both staff and faculty and also improve the campus climate.
- Likewise, the University Office for Diversity and Inclusion could look into the question of whether women’s salaries are equal to men’s in equivalent positions.

- It could prove fruitful to establish a ‘Meta-Diversity and Inclusion’ student club, which would be composed of representatives from all student clubs that promote diversity and inclusion, so that they too can communicate with and support each other.
- The DIVTF also recommends that efforts should be made to create an alumni diversity think tank and/or support group, which could work with the CODI to enhance diversity and inclusion on campus as well as provide mentors and conversational partners for our faculty, staff, and students.
- Mentoring for all 3 Clark constituencies should not be underestimated. The DIVTF heard from members of all 3 groups about the importance of mentoring. For this purpose, the University Office for Diversity and Inclusion could coordinate mentors with those who would like to benefit from such advice. ALANA would remain a key player for students seeking such guidance.
- Related to mentoring, in conjunction with Human Resources, the University Office for Diversity and Inclusion could coordinate workshops for the Clark community to heighten awareness and help navigate a variety of situations.
  - One student, for example, spoke about his desire to sort through issues of sexual identity and orientation.
  - Likewise, a number of years ago, a faculty member commented that a Chinese MA applicant did not have what it takes, because she failed to list her strengths in her application—when reminded of cultural factors that encourage modesty, he was more receptive to her application.
- The Office could also determine what needs to be done to make Clark’s campus grounds accessible to all and design a program for its implementation, with concrete goals and progress reports.
- Safety precautions should continue to be regularly reviewed and improved.

There are certainly other measures that should be implemented, but determining what they are, whether the above are the most immediate, and in what time frame measures should be implemented will be the work of the CODI.

**Programming:**

Centralizing will allow Clark to see more clearly what work remains to be done and to create a timeline and priorities for that work. To ensure that diversity and inclusion are not ignored during that period of
time, programming efforts should occur simultaneously, for programming enables diversity and inclusion to become integral principles of Clark’s campus culture.

- Again at the top of the list, the CODI could work with Human Resources to implement methods for increasing the likelihood that staff and faculty from underrepresented groups are hired. In a meeting with Jacqueline Capomacchio and the DIVTF, for example, participants brainstormed to arrive at a voluntary self-identification form, which would also ask the applicant whether it could be shared with the hiring department.

- Efforts to increase interaction and understanding of international faculty, staff, and students were deemed important by a variety of Clark members. They should not be seen as ‘add-ons.’

- In conjunction with Human Resources, efforts to train staff and faculty with respect to sexual and gender diversity could be helpful to our campus climate. We need a well-trained person as well to whom victims involved in traumatic events such as rape could turn.

- The CODI could work with UAB and various departments to develop academic criteria for courses with diversity and inclusion content, possibly anchored in the newly transformed Race and Ethnicity concentration, Ethnicity Studies.

- The CODI could work with UAB as well to effect what several students have suggested as a much desired improvement: a diversity and inclusion requirement as part of the PLS. The CODI could work with UAB to assess the need, and if determined beneficial, to help implement the requirement.

- The CODI could also work with various constituencies to hold events each year that enhance our knowledge and appreciation of diversity and inclusion issues. The impact of such events varies, of course, from individual to individual, but can prove to create the kind of bond that enhances community, and hence our campus culture.
  - For example, a staff member relates how moved she was when participating in a Diversity in Athletics event years ago at Springfield College, an event that remains a positive memory.
  - Events of this kind have been successful at Clark and should be continued; thus, the annual Gala event as well as the Millennium Leadership Conference not only draw large audiences, but have also frequently impressed faculty and staff as well as fellow students.

- Beyond events, both faculty and staff articulated the desire to have more venues for simply socializing, to feel more integrated into the Clark community, perhaps with brown-bag lectures offered by Clark members.

**Research and Information-Gathering:**
In order to keep abreast of diversity and inclusion efforts across the US and at institutions like Clark, the DIVTF recommends that the University Office of Diversity and Inclusion regularly:

- research diversity efforts and programs nationally and compare theirs with Clark’s record;
- inspect Clark’s campus grounds regularly to measure progress with respect to disability access;
- report regularly to the faculty on progress with respect to Clark’s efforts as well as in the context of US institutions of higher education; and
- implement a campus climate survey once every three years.
  - In implementing future surveys, opinions might well be gathered on recent measures to improve the campus climate.
  - It may also prove useful to survey alums as well, perhaps at different intervals.

**Communication:**
It is likely that potential administrators, faculty, staff members, and students from underrepresented groups gather information about Clark and other institutions of higher learning from the web. Clark’s website, as stated in the Preface, currently has little that communicates what we accomplish in terms of diversity and inclusion. Thus, the DIVTF recommends that the University Office for Diversity and Inclusion:

• articulate a Mission Statement for the Office that may be considered as an integral part of Clark’s mission statement as well as post goals and progress reports (something on the order of those articulated by the University of Denver, as quoted above, may prove to be a fruitful starting point);
• work with Paula David (who has agreed to do so) to enhance Clark’s website and implement ways to feature diversity and inclusion;
• communicate to the Clark community and beyond what scholarship on diversity is being conducted at Clark;
• publicize staff efforts and events, such as diversity and inclusion workshops held in conjunction with Human Resources, Fulbright and other international successes, successful diversity and inclusion grants, and events such as the Millennial Leadership Conference and the International Gala event; and
• establish a Facebook site to enhance communication with students.

Clark Diversity and Inclusion Beyond the Campus

Linkages and Networks:
Clark’s CODI would be ideally poised to establish lasting links between Clark and the community, as made clear in a Mosakowski-supported survey conducted principally by Ravi Perry, which indicates, among other things, a high degree of dissatisfaction expressed by African Americans living in Worcester. These findings are underscored by the Colleges of Worcester Consortium’s website publication of a Multicultural Resource Guide, that under “Consortium Multicultural Affairs Contacts” lists solely the Consortium ALANA Support Network, which meets monthly. Thus, there is fruitful ground not only to enrich diversity and inclusion at Clark on multiple levels, but also to enhance relationships with Worcester, a significant portion of which (if not all) could form LEEP linkages.

Ideally, Clark’s CODI could also establish links with external fora, such as the Liberal Arts Diversity Officers, a consortium linking Middlebury, Wesleyan, and Williams (Montaño, p.1), in order to keep national, and perhaps international, communication lines open that could stimulate thinking and action.

More specifically, as offered by Michael Bamberg, perhaps Clark’s former relationship with Howard University could be re-visited, or new ones initiated.

In addition, the University Office for Diversity and Inclusion could provide information and assistance for scholars from underrepresented groups to link with one another through established networks.

Grant-Writing:
Importantly, the CODI could consult with the Dean of Research so that grants could be submitted that would help fund positions and programming. Seed grants, for example, that would enable visiting faculty to teach or research at Clark could be highly beneficial to our campus climate as a whole.
• See Appendix 10 for the kind of grants that could help us, as envisioned by *Imagining America* and the *Center for Institutional Social Change*, application for which is unfortunately too early for our current efforts.

• Related to this point, the CODI could help identify a faculty member willing to take on the responsibility of *Imagining America* or similar organizations.

Indeed, as suggested by a number of faculty, grants that would welcome visiting faculty and speakers, who could be considered candidates for tenure-track positions, could improve our chances to hire more diverse faculty.

• David Hibbett, for example, suggested a Diversity Fellows program that could lead to tenure-line positions.

• Robert Ross proposed a series parallel to the Higgins School of the Humanities African American Intellectual Lecture Series, that could, for example, focus on the ghetto and African American life, working situations, culture, and the arts in the 20th century. In addition, there could be courses and FYI seminars clustered around the series. Perhaps most importantly, speakers in the series could be African American PhDs, who may then be encouraged to apply to tenure-track positions.

**Fund-Raising:**

In the same vein, the CODI could work with University Advancement to establish links with alumnae/-i, who may prove willing to support diversity and inclusion efforts on campus. A think tank or alumnae/-i group could help enrich Clark in many ways and simultaneously deepen links between alumnae/-i of underrepresented groups and Clark.

There is great potential for such synergy. For example, with respect to relationships and friendships established across groups, Corine K. Claxton, cited above, wrote:

> Yes, the friendships and connections I developed with international students was a very important part of my Clark experience. I remember sitting in my political science classes and listening to my fellow classmates from various parts of the world provide their perspectives on various topics. My peers challenged me to think critically about the views and assumptions I held as an American and a Westerner. The very first person I became friends with during orientation was a young woman from Cameroon. It has been over a decade since we met and she is my closest friend. We still spend hours on the phone talking about current events, culture and international politics. Besides the class discussion, it was really nice to connect with different people on a social level.

In an effort to support and enhance the university’s plan to implement a comprehensive campaign effort as well as a new model of engagement for alumni, family, and friends, the Diversity Task Force strongly recommends the establishment of an advisory committee. The purpose of the committee is three-fold:

1) to design and intensify their personal connections with the University;

2) to drive institutional success as it relates to diversity and inclusion; and

3) to increase philanthropic support with respect to diversity and inclusion.

We propose the following draft language to serve as the committee’s charge:

1) Work with faculty, administrators, and staff to recommend enhancements to the CODI on issues of diversity and inclusion on and off campus;
2) Assist with the development of strong alumni, family, and friend networks to promote engagement opportunities that will support a sustainable culture of giving, inclusion, and network building;

3) Support the development of resource generation from alumni, family, and friends of ALANA and other underrepresented groups in support of diversity and inclusion, including related LEEP initiatives, either through direct gifts or through efforts to acquire gifts and other resources. Some examples of support could include:
   • endowed funds in support of faculty chairs, scholarships, and fellowships;
   • a Visiting Scholar or Scholar-in-Residence Program to support the extended visit of a scholar who would engage in guest class lecturing, special campus events, and public lectures;
   • race/ethnicity-based LEEP teaching and research activities, such as course development and team-taught courses;
   • graduate student research assistantships and travel funds for students whose work deals specifically with race/ethnicity; and
   • undergraduate student research grants or awards for outstanding undergraduate student research on race/ethnicity.

4) Develop meaningful opportunities for engagement through targeted events, lectures, and presentations on and off campus.

Perhaps much of the above could be coordinated with grant-writing and, for example, organized around already established venues, like the E. Franklin Frazier Chair.

**Study Abroad:**
In addition to enhancing such relations, it may prove useful for the Office of Study Abroad Programs to work with the CODI to enhance possibilities for students of underrepresented groups to study and intern abroad. As Karin Fischer reports for The Chronicle, “Racial and ethnic minorities, men, working adults, lower-income and first-generation college students, and those with disabilities—all are underrepresented abroad” (p.1).

Indeed, this seems to be an opportune time to launch such an effort. The Diversity Abroad Network, for example, developed the first US survey this year with respect to US diverse groups studying abroad, the State of Diversity in Education Abroad Survey, administered by Andrew Gordon, which should provide a better picture of who studies abroad. They also provide information on grants.

**Selecting the Chief Officer for Diversity and Inclusion**
Ideally, the CODI would be a tenured faculty member who is well respected by the Clark community, has demonstrated scholarly and/or community expertise in diversity and inclusion matters, and has scholarly credentials in her/his field.

The DIVTF recommends further that the CODI use his/her first 1 or 2 years in office to develop a comprehensive vision and to propose a budgeted structure to implement the vision, while, as stated above, implementing programming and other initiatives.

**The Selection Process:**
The position has been approved by President David Angel to run out of his office. The DIVTF recommends that President Angel work with academic governance to determine a search process and
move forward as quickly as possible to appoint a CODI. Among the CODI’s first tasks will be the selection of a Committee for Diversity and Inclusion.

**Budget:**
If the CODI should use her/his first phase in office to develop a comprehensive vision and to propose a budgeted structure to implement this vision, it is imperative that s/he work with the President particularly in terms of the timing of a full launch of the University Office for Diversity and Inclusion.

An initial phase seems prudent, since no single faculty member not currently an academic administrator is likely to know how the campus operates in all its constituencies. Additionally, by spending time investigating and garnering feedback, the CODI is likely to gain the support necessary to implement diversity and inclusion measures. During the initial phase, s/he will also be working on programming, grant-writing, and other efforts, depending on the strengths of the individual appointed.

An additional benefit of an initial planning phase is that in these tough financial times, thorough planning in conjunction with administrators and PBR can result in a realistically timed full budget for the years thereafter.

Meanwhile, the significant costs in the initial phase should include the following:

The CODI may continue to teach one course per semester, which means that the CODI’s home department will likely need to replace courses. In time, as implementation becomes more time-consuming, and in consultation with the Academic Administration, the CODI could be released from teaching duties.

The CODI will need to have staff support as well, which, initially, could mean a half-time position, which will likely convert to a full-time position over time.

Finally, the third item that has significant cost implications is the programming of events and meetings, which should not be delayed, but be a significant part of the University Office of Diversity and Inclusion’s work even in the first year.

For these three items, the costs below are calculated *per annum*:

| Part-time course replacements: | $24,000 |
| Part-time staff support: | $25,000 |
| Programming: | **$100,000** |

Total: **$149,000**

This prudent budget covers the first phase. Thereafter, the CODI will work with the appropriate committees, the academic administration, and the President to secure a larger budget, commensurate with the University Office of Diversity and Inclusion’s mission. By this time, hopefully, grants and alumnae/-i support will have proven viable additional sources of income.

**Performance Criteria:**
Since the CODI will likely be a faculty member, it is important to consider personnel issues. Most likely, the CODI will be someone who has been or will be involved with what has come to be known as
engaged scholarship. As Susan Sturm, et al. demonstrate in a catalyst paper supported by the *Center for Institutional and Social Change* along with *Imagining America*:

> A growing body of research has demonstrated that women and faculty of color are more likely to engage in both interdisciplinary and community-service-related behaviors, including community engaged and inclusive pedagogical practice in teaching and learning and building research agendas related to public problem-solving in local communities. (p. 11)

Indeed, if LEEP is to be successful, then *all* faculty, but especially junior faculty, participating in engaged scholarship need to be reassured that their efforts count substantially. In other words, while possibly critical to the CODI, personnel assessments are just as important for all faculty members, who wish to promote diversity and inclusion substantively.

The COP and the DIVTF have thus focused on these three passages concerning personnel cases for the faculty.

From the Faculty Handbook, Section 3 on Standards, p. 23 (our bolded italics):

**Addressing scholarly or creative accomplishments**

(2)(a)

Scholarly or creative achievement of recognized professional merit in the individual’s chosen field, together with promise of its continuance. While this is most commonly, *though not invariably*, shown by publication or by other professional recognition outside the University, *accomplishments equivalent to publication may be substituted where appropriate*.

**Addressing service**

(2)(c)

Significant contribution *to the essential educational work* of the University outside the classroom, including development of departmental programs, and participation in University planning or shaping of educational policy, in conspicuously important student advisory functions and committee work, and in academically relevant civic and committee services.

**Addressing decision-making**

(3)(a)

*Faculty bodies responsible for personnel decision-making must be allowed latitude for defining the degree of accomplishment necessary in each area,* as well as the balance of accomplishments in the several areas. Individual cases must be considered as individual cases, on their merits, and in light of all relevant facts.

While engaged scholarship may resemble service as articulated in (2)(c) in various aspects, and there may certainly be overlap, the difference may be highlighted in an analogy to teaching. Thus, while a seminar on Chaucer may treat materials that Chaucerian scholars analyze and treat, generally, differences lie in levels of analytical sophistication, depth of detail and historical contextualizing, and interpretive skills. So too, engaged scholarship may resemble service, in that both activities may involve faculty members in addressing communities, just as seminar students and Chaucerian experts both treat the same narratives. However, just as the Chaucerian has a greater degree of expertise and knowledge
which allows her/his insights to result in publication, so too the scholar involved in engaged scholarship not only addresses a particular community, s/he also brings advanced theoretical and experiential knowledge to bear on a project, which can result in publication in the narrow and a broader sense. Thus, s/he may publish her/his results in journals or other venues dedicated to engaged scholarship, or, in a broader sense, her/his research and articulation of that research into actions may result in legislation, in the establishment of a group or structure aimed at solving critically analyzed problems, and in the furthering of long-term solutions to promote diversity and inclusion, as Clark science faculty have been doing when, for example, they work with Tom Del Prete and the Education Department to teach sciences in local high schools.5

Consequently, the DIVTF urges all departments to review their Departmental Personnel Guidelines and, if appropriate to the department’s faculty members, to make provisions, as suggested in (3)(a) above, to allow that department’s faculty members to be evaluated for their engaged scholarship. Consonant with Clark procedure, the revised guidelines would have to be approved by COP.

Importantly:
• Engaged scholarship is critical to the achievement of diversity and inclusion at Clark.
• Likewise, if LEEP is to succeed, then engaged scholarship must be recognized.
• The recognition of engaged scholarship is not intended to replace more traditional forms of scholarship, but rather, to supplement it.
• In any given year, engaged scholarship could be the primary focus of a faculty member’s scholarly or creative activity, or a combination of engaged scholarship and more traditional forms may be considered.
• The DIVTF does not count engaged scholarship as service in part because, as described in (2)(c) above, service is “educational work,” necessary per se, but not requiring the same scholarly skills that engaged scholarship requires.

While this measure would benefit all faculty members involved in engaged scholarship, as well as Clark as an institution, it would certainly benefit the CODI. Thus, finally, the DIVTF recommends that the CODI work with COP and Jack Foley to develop examples of engaged scholarship so that theory may be illustrated in practice.

Conclusion
Echoing some findings of Susan Sturm’s study, Catherine Rampell wrote for The New York Times in March 2011, about the trend of college graduates preferring public service jobs. With caution, she reports, “‘The millennial generation is a generation that is just more interested in making a difference than making a dollar,’ said Max Stier, the president and chief executive of the Partnership for Public Service, a nonprofit group that advises government recruiting efforts” (p.2). Focused on civic goals, the National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement arrived at a similar conclusion this year. Arguing that we are in a ‘crucible moment’ in our nation’s history, they make the case for “civic learning and democratic engagement—US and global—an animating national priority” (p. 14). A critical component of their focus is diversity. They write:

The United States is “the most religiously diverse nation on earth” (Eck 2002, 4), and is more racially diverse than ever. By 2045 communities of color will constitute at least 50

5 Cf. Alan I. Leshner’s commentary on the need to reward science faculty who promote diversity innovatively.
percent nationwide (Roberts 2008), as is already the case in some states. Immigrants now make up 12.5 percent of the US population (Gryn and Larsen 2010). Intensified immigration and refugee populations swirling around the entire globe have resulted in similarly dramatic demographic shifts on almost every continent. Having the capacity to draw on core democratic processes to negotiate the increased diversity will secure a stable future. (p. 20)

With more members of underrepresented groups attending college, adjustments will certainly be made across the US. The resulting cultural wealth that diverse perspectives can stimulate for any organization obtains especially for higher education, which has taken pride in its dichotomous mission: while serving to preserve knowledge, universities also expand our intellectual and creative horizons.

Given the democratic principle of civil inclusiveness and the concomitant importance of service, it makes sense to develop diversity and inclusion measures judiciously. More importantly, because of the very nature of diversity, it is imperative that in these fraught times, we keep abreast of current issues and debates, as well as work towards the ideal of a civil and just society that promotes respect for all our responsible members.

To that end, the Diversity Task Force requests that the faculty accept this report.
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