**To**: The Faculty

**From**: SunHee Kim Gertz, Chair of the Diversity Task Force 2011-12 **Date**: 3 April 2012

**Re**: The Diversity Task Force Report: Executive Summary

In April 2011, the Academic and Financial Plan mandated that a Diversity Task Force be created in order “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” (p. 12). In Fall 2011, the Diversity Task Force, comprising 4 faculty (Esteban Cardemil, Esther Jones, Ravi Perry, and myself), 3 staff (Amy Daly Gardner, Andy McGadney, and Mounira Morris), and 3 students (Maya Baum, Paris Prince, and Hannah Yukon), was formed and began the task of assessing the campus climate. Our report with recommendations was distributed on 30 March 2012. We are requesting that the faculty accept the report at the 11 April 2012 faculty assembly.

In order to assess the campus climate, we met with all 17 academic departments and with directly relevant faculty governance committees (Steering, PBR, COP, and IRB). In addition, we had monthly meetings with the Provost, as well as meetings with both exempt and non-exempt staff, with undergraduate and graduate students, and with a series of individuals, including the President, various Vice-Presidents and Deans, Directors, faculty, staff, and the Director of Multicultural Education at Holy Cross. We also researched Clark’s archives and external materials on diversity including scholarly articles, reports, journalistic columns, book-length studies and university websites. Finally, Esteban Cardemil authored, administered, and evaluated three surveys for the entire Clark community.

With data gathered and assessed, we formulated our report, in which, after detailing the process, briefly reviewing the history of diversity at Clark and in the US, sketching comparable universities’ efforts, and reviewing the results of 2 prior diversity task forces and relevant portions of the NEASC self-study, we make our recommendations.

We found that the problems of diversity and inclusion are real and multiple, but that they emerge out of neglect rather than out of active resistance. Everyone we met with was positively inclined towards a more diverse and inclusive environment. Due to neglect, however, we at Clark have not been able to institute measures that would allow for such a community. Everything from our ‘welcome mat’ (the Clark website) to attracting and mentoring a diverse and inclusive community suffers from a lack of focus that hinders efforts to more closely reconcile the ideal with the real. The question we tried to answer, then, was how can we remedy the situation? First and foremost, we concluded, an active, continuous presence dedicated to diversity and inclusion needs to be established, by means of:

* an Office of Diversity and Inclusion;
* a tenured faculty member directing the office (title TBD);
* a standing committee comprising representatives from the faculty, staff, student body (undergraduate as well as graduate), and academic administration; and
* a liaison between the Office and Clark’s Board of Trustees.

Absolutely critical to the success of our recommendation is David Angel’s positive response: unequivocally recognizing the need, he agreed to a diversity and inclusion leader operating out of his office.

After the diversity and inclusion leader develops and gains support for a comprehensive plan through working with the President, appropriate governance committees, the academic administration, and the Clark community, s/he will accelerate ongoing efforts to establish a structured approach to promoting diversity and inclusion. We have both internal and external recommendations for this work as well.

* Internally, the work involves centralizing, programming, research and information gathering, and communication (pp. 31-34).
* Externally, it will be important to establish linkages and networks, and participate in grant-writing and fund-raising (pp. 34-36).

Finally, we address a selection process, an initial budget, and personnel issues (pp. 36-39).

We hope you have the time to read the report and review the appendices, but given the time of year and the length of the report, if you can read only a few pages, **we recommend focusing on the NEASC summary (pp. 19-20) and the Diversity Task Force recommendations (pp. 27-39).**

Respectfully submitted,

SunHee Kim Gertz, Department of English