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Diversity, Inclusion and Equity Defined

This report focuses not just on diversity, but also on inclusion and equity. Unfortunately, diversity sometimes gets reduced to demographic diversity—racial/ethnic, gender, and social class. We use it in a broader sense:

**Diversity**
Dimensions of difference meaningful to individuals and groups, including race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, ability/disability, social class, region, cultural affiliation (country of origin, religion, politics, lifestyle, etc.), learning styles, family location and ideology.

**Inclusion**
To borrow from the Association of American Colleges and Universities, we mean “the active, intentional, and ongoing engagement with diversity—in people, in the curriculum, in the cocurriculum and in communities . . .—in ways that increase one’s awareness, content knowledge, cognitive sophistication, and empathetic understanding” of people, their work and institutions.¹

**Equity**
Equity, finally, means that all members of the community have access to the knowledge and opportunities that the college community values or espouses.

Members of the Diversity Task Force

The college’s Diversity Task Force was created with the purpose of reassessing and energetically renewing its efforts in diversity, specifically charged with carefully examining diversity in the college from its leadership, personnel and climate to recruitment, retention, scholarship and curriculum.
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Preface

The Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Report is a report of the Diversity Task Force (task force) in the College of Arts and Humanities intended to advance dialogue and action related to issues of diversity.

Following the publication of the University’s Strategic Plan for Diversity, Transforming Maryland: Expectations for Excellence in Diversity and Inclusion (2010), Dean Bonnie Thornton Dill decided to form a complimentary initiative on behalf of the College.

In November 2011, the Dean appointed the task force for the “purpose of reassessing and energetically renewing the College’s efforts in diversity.” She charged the group with “carefully examining diversity in the College from its leaderships, climate, recruitment, retention, scholarship and curriculum.”

The task force examined available data, both quantitative and qualitative, and held a series of focus groups with undergraduate and graduate students, faculty and staff to assess the College’s current standings as related to diversity and inclusion. It also looked at national data and reports and talked with many people in the College and on Campus. The narrative that many task force members believed, that the College was vastly diverse, turned out to be overdrawn. While the College is a leader in interdisciplinary, diverse curriculum like American Studies, Women’s Studies, Jewish Studies and more and administers nationally recognized cultural and research centers like the Center for Race, Gender and Ethnicity and the David C. Driskell Center, current findings suggest that the College is not a particularly diverse place with regard to racial diversity; gender imbalances continue to characterize faculty and staff; and diversity is not widely realized across the units. Measures of other dimensions of difference—social class, nationality, learning style, sexual orientation, ideology and ability among other forms of diversity—are not readily available, but anecdotal evidence suggests mixed results in regard to inclusion.

The Challenge

Maryland will become a majority minority state within a decade, but it is already diverse, in terms of demography and cultural attributes, values and expectations. As we heard from students, they are coming into the College having lived in diverse communities and expect more opportunities to explore diversity and to be treated as if their differences matter. We also heard from faculty and staff that they expect greater inclusion and equity.

The report provides insight into the information gathered from multiple sources and illuminates

---

2 Based on the 2010 Census, projections for the National Capital Region are for people of color to make up 52.6% of the population by 2020. Projections prepared by the Maryland Department of Planning, June 2010 and November 2010.
the importance of continued self-assessment. It advances arguments for the importance of excellence through diversity. It recommends that the College take the lead in planning and changing its approach, composition and climate as related to diversity, inclusion and equity. It recognizes that students seem to be most in tune with the need for and possibilities of diversity and inclusion. It identifies academic and work silos that isolate and limit community. It acknowledges the lack of earnest valuing and/or a lack of awareness of diversity, inclusion, and equity that must be addressed. It reaffirms that the enhancement of diversity, inclusion and equity will require leadership, as well as an administrative commitment and infrastructure that are not currently in place.

Ultimately, we hope that the report will make visible the deep work the College must undertake to realize its goals related to diversity, inclusion and equity, and calls on the Dean, dean’s office senior staff, chairs and directors to provide further a platform for discussion on this important topic. Faculty, staff and students also have important roles in advancing the recommendations of this report, and we’re hopeful that the report and the dean’s forthcoming diversity implementation plan will provide vision for this initiative.

I’d like to give special thanks to the people of the committee who served with me over the past 24 months to deliberate over these issues and who provided passionate and thoughtful recommendations to the report. Thanks also to the chairs, faculty, staff and students who weighed in on focus group discussions and in other forums and formats.

Nancy L. Struna
Professor and Chair, Department of American Studies
Chair, College of Arts & Humanities Diversity Task Force
From the Dean

-We strive to expand opportunities for all of our students to acquire a nuanced understanding of the world as a place of difference and diversity across time and cultures.

The sentence above from the College’s vision statement affirmatively asserts the College’s commitment to diversity and inclusion. Excellence in ARHU depends upon our having a diverse faculty, staff and student body along with an inclusive and supportive environment that nurtures growth and productivity. Realizing this vision will not only enrich our community; it will enliven our curriculum and enhance our capacity to fulfill our mission of creating “global citizens equipped to assess received opinion, make independent judgments, and value the transforming power of the imagination.”

Diversity and inclusion are linked to structural inequalities and to historical and contemporary patterns that systematically deny or restrict opportunity based group membership. This report assesses data for underrepresented minorities and women; groups for whom the largest amount of data is available. It also challenges us to identify other groups who have been discriminated against for any number of reasons – ethnicity, age, disability, sexual orientation, national origin or religion – and for whom there are clear patterns of constraint within the University and the larger society. Finally, as an institution with a legacy of slavery and Jim Crow discrimination as well as a land-grant mission to serve the citizens of Maryland, we have a particular responsibility to address domestic inequalities at the same time that we seek to increase our international profile and expand our global engagements.

Inspired by the campus strategic plan’s call for the University “to energetically renew its efforts in diversity,” I have considered the recommendations from the ARHU task force in that context. Thus, the College Implementation Plan section of this document outlines goals, objectives and actions in accordance with the three goals set forth in the University’s strategic diversity plan, which are:

**Goal 1**
To ensure policies and structures are in place at all levels of the University to support transformational leadership, recruitment, and inclusion efforts, and to institutionalize campus diversity goals. **We will provide the leadership and infrastructure needed to create a more diverse and inclusive population in the College of Arts and Humanities.**

**Goal 2**
To foster a positive climate that promotes student success and encourages faculty and staff members to flourish. **We will create a College climate in which diversity, inclusion and equity are valued and realized at both the College and Unit levels throughout the College of Arts and Humanities.**

**Goal 3**
To promote a vision across the University that fully appreciates diversity as a core value and educational benefit to be studied, cultivated, and embraced as a vital component of personal development and growth. **We will diversify academic programs by making diversity and inclusion intentional in teaching and learning across the curriculum of the College of Arts and Humanities.**

Bonnie Thornton Dill, Dean
Data Analysis & Discussion

The Task Force (TF) gathered and reviewed a range of data. The major quantitative data came from IRPA Profiles (Appendix A) and included race/ethnicity and gender numbers and percentages for faculty, staff, and students. Comparable data for peer institutions are not readily available, and the IRPA office provided some graduates-by-department data from AAU institutions through FY2008. The latter proved not to be particularly useful. ADVANCE data for the College from Spring 2011 were also consulted. The primary qualitative data came from three graduate and undergraduate focus groups in Spring 2012, from faculty and staff focus groups in Fall 2012 (focus group questions and themes in Appendix B), from the TF chair’s discussions with some unit heads and their advisory committees, and from the Fall 2012 ARHU staff survey completed for the proposed Staff Council. We also consulted approximately 30 diversity plans from universities nationwide, Chronicle of Higher Education articles, Pew Foundation reports, and books and articles about diversity, inclusion, and equity in higher education. The material from these sources clearly provided a broader context, a broader understanding of issues and possibilities, and possible recommendations. Coupled with impressions from conversations we all had with colleagues in the College, this material is based on the discussions we had and the ways in which we interpreted institutional data.

Profiles Data

Race/Ethnicity

Table 1 provides an overview of the current racial/ethnic composition, by percentage, of the groups we have examined in the College, compared to the larger University. Given its high

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tenure/TT Faculty</th>
<th>Lecturers/Instructors</th>
<th>Exempt Staff</th>
<th>Non-exempt</th>
<th>UG students</th>
<th>Grad students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univ</td>
<td>Arhu</td>
<td>Univ</td>
<td>Arhu</td>
<td>Univ</td>
<td>Arhu</td>
<td>Univ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/AA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hisp/Lat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For/Intern</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AI = American Indian; AA = African American; Hisp/Lat = Hispanic/Latino; For = Foreign

3 All IRPA data are of bodies rather than FTEs.
percentage of whites among every group except non-exempt staff, the University’s composition is not in line with what one might expect given the racial/ethnic composition of the national capital region and the state of Maryland. Except for non-exempt staff and students, the University’s figures for whites are substantially higher than the 2010 Census levels for both the state (58% white) and the national capital region (51%), which would likely be lower now two years later. The College of Arts and Humanities is even more predominantly white, again except for non-exempt staff. Among this staff group, whites comprise 49% of total, but this does not mean that people of color are in the majority: the racial/ethnic backgrounds of 13% remain unknown. Relatively high percentages of unknown racial/ethnic self-identification are a complicating factor across the groups.

The College also generally has either smaller or near equal (+ or − 1) percentages of particular racial/ethnic minority populations compared to the University. Given the region’s and the state’s Asian, African American/Black diaspora, and Latina/o populations and history, the relatively small percentages of faculty, exempt staff, and students is striking. Individual unit analyses also reveal that only two academic departments have achieved representative racial/ethnic or a majority-minority faculty composition. The same statement is true for the composition of the graduate student population; one unit accounts for more than a third of the African American/Black graduate population. No unit has achieved representative racial/ethnic balance in its undergraduate population. For staff, a similar unit analysis is not particularly revealing, primarily because most units have so few staff.

Table 2 shows the relatively small percentage of change in the racial/ethnic composition of the College over the past decade. The highest percentage of change was eight percent, seen in both white tenured/tenure-track faculty and non-exempt staff. The percentage of Black/African American exempt staff increased by four percent over the ten years, but the percentage increase in other groups for all minorities was more commonly one to two percent.

### Table 2: Percentage Change in Racial/Ethnic Composition of ARHU, 2003-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tenure/TT Faculty</th>
<th>Lecturers/Instructors</th>
<th>Exempt Staff</th>
<th>Non-exempt Staff</th>
<th>UG students</th>
<th>Grad students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/AA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hisp/Lat</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For/Intern</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AI = American Indian; AA = African American; Hisp/Lat = Hispanic/Latino; For = Foreign

A comparison of ARHU with two other major colleges on campus, BSOS and CMNS, provides another perspective on current College racial/ethnic composition among faculty and students. Table
Table 3 presents these data, again in percentages.

Table 3: Racial/Ethnic Composition (%) – University, ARHU, BSOS, CMNS, Fall 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Faculty (EEO)</th>
<th>UG Students</th>
<th>Grad Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARHU</td>
<td>BSOS</td>
<td>CMNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/AA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hisp/Lat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For/Intern</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AI = American Indian; AA = African American; Hisp/Lat = Hispanic/Latino; For = Foreign

Several patterns in this table are worth noting. First, ARHU has a higher percentage of white faculty and students than do either of the other colleges. The College office might be wise to explore what units in the other colleges are doing to recruit a more diverse population in these groups. A second pattern focuses on the foreign/international population in both BSOS and CMNS, which is noticeably higher for faculty and graduate students whose recruitment is under the control of units. The precise point was actually raised in the TF chair’s discussion with the director and faculty advisory body in the School of Languages, Literatures, and Culture (SLLC):

The University’s count of people of international origin is predicated on census status. Our School has many faculty and students who came from abroad and are international; once naturalized, however, they do not “count” as foreign/international; hence our relatively small percentages.

It seems reasonable to suggest that CMNS in particular is likely more actively recruiting graduate students and faculty from abroad than do we, and their faculty do not obtain U.S. citizenship in the same numbers as do SLLC faculty or other international faculty in the ARHU. In short, the way in which the University quantifies foreign/international people does not capture adequately the international population in our College.

Gender

Table 4 presents the percentages of women and men for both the College and the University which are a bit more straightforward than the data on racial/ethnic composition.
Table 4: Gender Composition (%), ARHU compared to University, Fall 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tenure/TT Faculty</th>
<th>Lecturers/Instructors</th>
<th>Exempt Staff</th>
<th>Non-exempt Staff</th>
<th>UG students</th>
<th>Grad students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Univ</td>
<td>ARHU</td>
<td>Univ</td>
<td>ARHU</td>
<td>Univ</td>
<td>ARHU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to the University as a whole, all but one ARHU group has a larger proportion of women than men, and in some cases, substantially larger (i.e., staff and students). This pattern has persisted over the past decade. For staff in particular, the gender imbalance may result, at least in part from cultural expectations of office work as “women’s work.” A big question is what, if anything, do we want to do about the gender imbalance among College staff and students. At the very least, this is a question that warrants discussion in the College and its units, in part because of the economic and power issues that surface in discussions about climate and equity in units.

Where the traditional gender imbalance—more men than women—remains and has obvious implications for power relations, leadership, and decision-making, is at the rank of full professor. Men constitute 59% of the full professors in the College; women, 41%. Units and the College should be alerted to potential power imbalances at the unit level, which are sometimes manifested in uneven service obligations and a range of issues related to teaching and research. The ADVANCE initiative should be continued and supported. The College office should also consider the power differential evident in the gender imbalance at the full professor level when it comes to matters such as committee composition, all things related to the APT process, and the appointment of chairs and directors.

Focus Group Data

As noted earlier, members of the TF conducted four focus groups with key constituencies of the College. Both undergraduate and graduate students responded to specific questions and engaged in conversations last spring; faculty and staff groups did the same this fall. Sharon La Voy, the Director of Assessment in the University’s Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment and an expert in focus group research, convened and led all four groups. Members of the TF took notes. The questions asked of each group and the themes and ideas generated by the participants are included in their entirety in Appendix B.

Themes derived from these data help to flesh out the quantitative data and also provide information not captured in the numbers. About the former, the focus group responses and conversations reinforced our conclusion that the College is not currently a particularly diverse place, especially in terms of racial/ethnic membership. Students noted they were often the “only one” in a class and did not have access to mentors who looked like them. Faculty pointed out that some units have diversity faculty who are racial/ethnic minorities and whose fields are peripheral to the Eurocentric canon that dominates some disciplines. Staff revealed less about racial/ethnic diversity than about gender and
asked pointedly whether the College was recruiting men. Given the dominance of women among both exempt and non-exempt staff, the question seemed particularly meaningful to them, as they followed up by implicitly connecting wages and gender. “Are women earning livable wages” they asked.

The focus groups moved us beyond dimensions of diversity captured in the University’s quantitative data to other dimensions of difference: class, cultural background and traditions, ideology, and more. Staff respondents made clear the significance of class in some of their workplaces. Invariably, the faculty were on top, exempt staff had more flexibility than did non-exempt staff, and the latter are “most marginalized” and considered “non-professional.”

Although they could talk the language of diversity tied to demographic categories, all four groups agreed that this was a narrow conception. Both faculty and staff stated that diversity meant inclusiveness, respect for a broad range of individual and collective, culturally constituted differences, as well as an underlying condition necessary for one to retain and celebrate those differences and for others to understand and respect them. Students, too, discussed diversity and inclusion as inseparable dimensions, albeit of their lived experiences and normative expectations rather than of as yet unrealized goals.

On this point, the students made clear another pattern suggested in the IRPA data: they are the most diverse group and, in fact, they live diversity and expect it to permeate daily life. The faculty group concurred: students “have lived diversity and are more comfortable with a broad range of people, views, [and] experiences than are some faculty,” and “faculty diversity is not as broad or dynamic.” Thus we listened to what students said about the need to “create an infrastructure that includes follow through and support of initiatives,” about the “intentional inclusion of student input on all levels of diversity planning,” about the needs for “more exploration” and an expanded range of opportunities in and out of the classroom to examine diversity and for more training of faculty and graduate assistants who instruct students who come with multiple differences, including learning styles. They “do diversity,” and they want more people in the College to do it.

Finally, all groups offered comments about the College and its climate. The faculty clearly stated that “this isn’t a very welcoming place” and called for leadership “to come from the College and at the unit level to make diversity a viable dimension of everyday life.” Staff voiced their approval of the new staff council, which they see as giving them an opportunity to get out of their “silos” and be part of a College community. This latter point suggests that staff want to help shape a College community, a formation necessary for greater inclusion, but they also believe that the College office and their department leaders need to make their activity possible. This echoes what faculty said about leadership removing obstacles for collaboration as well as embracing diversity across units. Students, for whom even the phrase “ARHU experience” was meaningful in ways it was not for faculty and staff, just seemed to assume that there was a college community and that the actions they recommended would occur across units.
We believe that these conversations with students, staff, and faculty were very revealing, and there
should probably be more of them in the future. They confirm what the IRPA data suggest about the
minimal demographic diversity in the College as a whole, speak to the consequences for people of
color and women, and make clear that diversity involves more than demography and is a means to
inclusion. They also introduce ideas and concerns not evident in the numbers presented: there are
only pockets of diversity in the College; traditional practices, expectations, and hierarchies in some
units deter diversity, inclusion, and equity; College and unit leaders need to step up activity and
expectations for enhanced diversity and inclusion; the College needs to “put its money where its
mouth is” if the College is finally and really going to become diverse and inclusive and realize both as
foundations of excellence.
Task Force Recommendations

*Climate, Leadership, Infrastructure*

These recommendations mesh with three sets of themes evident in the conversations with faculty, staff, and students. One is about the College climate. Faculty and staff especially see themselves as members of departments, or centers, or other kinds of units. Units do have climates, and some units actively encourage hiring that increases diversity, professional development, interdisciplinarity, and seek out resources and relations across the University to enhance diversity and inclusiveness. Other units are quite different, however, and it was in the context of local climate critique that the term “silo” arose. People explained that they were not encouraged to go outside the unit, to “to stay in their place” or to forego collaboration and interdisciplinary development.

A second pertinent theme involved leadership, and it seems clear that climate and leadership are intricately bound. Where there are positive leaders—whether those be individuals or collectives—committed to diversity, inclusion, and equity, the climate is more open and members believe they are empowered. To create a College climate in which diversity, inclusion, and equity are realized and valued, the Dean and her staff must be willing to make the case for diversity, inclusion, and equity and work with and through chairs and directors. We are not advocating leadership from the College alone, but rather collaboration with unit chairs, directors, and advisory bodies. The development of a College climate requires buy-in from units and an understanding of the possibility of dual membership. Citizenship in the College and unit citizenship are not mutually exclusive.

**Climate and Leadership Recommendations**

1. Perhaps in conjunction with the University’s Office of Diversity and Inclusion, the Dean should commission a comprehensive climate survey to be completed by faculty, staff, and students. The survey would have two important goals: (a) to acquire finer detail about the climate for diversity, inclusion, and equity throughout the College than this TF has been able to determine, and (b) to identify a broader array of best practices so these can be shared throughout the College. The College office must set the tone for and serve as a model for a more diverse, inclusive, and equitable College and take the lead in establishing a positive College climate. The Dean and her/his staff should also negotiate expectations with units, hold all units accountable for achieving goals, and reward successful units.

2. In a more stable economic climate, the Dean might appoint a full-time associate dean whose portfolio focus would be diversity, inclusion, and equity, but the current fiscal reality probably makes that appointment unlikely. Instead, members of the Dean’s staff should assume responsibilities for diversity, inclusion, and equity appropriate to their portfolios. Should a new associate dean position become possible in the future, it might be wise to maintain particular responsibilities for diversity, inclusion, and equity in the portfolios of current ADs, too.

3. Specifically related to the prior recommendation, the Dean should incorporate statements of particular responsibilities for diversity, inclusion, and equity within the PRDs and/or
appointment letters of all members of her staff and evaluate them accordingly. Of particular importance is the composition of College committees, unit searches, curriculum, research and scholarship, community engagement and outreach, and finance.

4. The Dean should incorporate statements of particular responsibilities for diversity, inclusion, and equity within the PRDs and/or appointment letters of all chairs and directors and evaluate them accordingly.

5. Chairs and directors should assume the responsibility for ensuring that diversity, equity, and inclusion are active principles guiding programs (including curriculum research and scholarship, outreach, professional development), hiring, recruitment and retention (of faculty, students, and staff), and professional development within the units.

6. Chairs should complete an annual review of IRPA demographic data on faculty, staff, and students and incorporate the results within hiring, recruitment and retention, curriculum development, and professional development goals and plans.

7. Chairs and directors should engage faculty and staff in earnest conversations about the content, directions, and beneficiaries of their programs five and ten years in the future. To facilitate those conversations, this task force provides templates in Appendix C for considerations of research/scholarship and curriculum within academic units and programmatic directions of centers and other units.

A third theme that emerged from both our conversations with faculty, staff, and students and discussions within the TF involved infrastructure. In simple terms, we heard and concluded that facilities, services, budget, and College and unit practices, among other things, need to be committed to realizing diversity, inclusion, and equity at both the College and unit levels.

**Infrastructure Recommendations**

1. Provide regular training for administrators, unit heads, and search committees about best practices and campus policies about diversity, inclusion, and equity.
2. Develop the financial and scholarly resources and infrastructure to support inclusive research, teaching, and service.
3. Encourage innovation in research, teaching, and public service focused on equity, inclusion and diversity, particularly ones that connect faculty and student research and reach out to external communities.
4. Incorporate expectations for and recognition of diversity and inclusion-related practices within faculty hiring procedures and decisions.
5. Align promotion and merit reward policies and practices with the College and campus emphasis on diversity, inclusion, and equity.
6. Increase systematic training about and provide concrete incentives and rewards for regular and systematic mentoring for faculty, staff, and students.
7. Encourage and support community-building activities within all units in the College.
8. Work with campus facilities officials to ensure full access to buildings and rooms.
9. Work with OIT to ensure that assistive technologies and alternative media are available to faculty, staff and students who need them.
Recruitment and Retention

One of the patterns we see in the quantitative and qualitative data combined is the at-best marginal improvement in the numbers of people of color, especially in the faculty, and the persisting power imbalance among men and women across faculty ranks. Given expected demographic shifts in the state and regional population before and after 2020, both of these dimensions require change. Some of the recommendations in the prior section should produce more desirable demographic changes, as well as in other dimensions of diversity. More systematic recruitment and retention efforts will also be needed not only to change the racial/ethnic and gender composition of College faculty, staff, and students, but also to create a more diverse and inclusive College population on other dimensions of diversity, including sexual orientation, social class, ability/disability, ideology, and more. The College and Departments need to work together to examine recruitment and retention efforts to ensure that all dimensions of diversity are being addressed and readdressed. Outreach efforts need to be strategically coordinated and intentional in order to be most effective.

Undergraduate recruitment is primarily a process controlled by the University, with the College Office of Student Affairs coordinating College recruitment efforts and participating in programs such as Visit Maryland and open houses. Student Affairs and the office of Communications have also worked together to update recruitment material supplied by the academic units. It appears that only the School of Music has its own recruitment efforts, but the School has had mixed success and support from Undergraduate Admissions because of its emphasis on performance criteria.

We do not know what the retention patterns of distinct groups of undergraduate students are, although we do think that discovering how students of color or first-generation college students fare in the context of all undergraduate students would be a valuable exercise for units. In contrast to recruitment, retention of undergraduate students is the responsibility of academic units with significant guidance and recommended practices coming from the College’s Office of Student Affairs. The latter also assigns a retention advisor to all students on academic probation. It would undoubtedly benefit students and the units themselves if we were to recommend a unit-level retention analysis and, at the college level, the collection of unit best practices for retention.

Although the Graduate School has started to recruit students of color and ARHU briefly tried to organize a recruitment visit to some historically Black college, the recruitment of students of color, of international students, of students from working class backgrounds, and more, remains primarily the responsibility of individual units, as is retention. Again, in terms of understanding what’s going on at the unit level, we have only IRPA numbers to go by, and the picture in most units in terms of demographic diversity is not representative of state and regional demographic data. As is the case with undergraduate students, a unit-level analysis of retention results and the collection of best practices from units succeeding in diversifying and graduating their students seems warranted.

We have no systematic analysis of staff recruitment and retention. Anecdotal reports from unit heads do suggest that insufficient budgets have eliminated raises and limit broadening recruitment pools. Some units do encourage staff to take advantage of University trainings and workshops, which
can enhance and broaden staff skill sets, but whether such efforts positively affect retention or simply permit individual staff members to leave a unit for a “better” job remains unknown.

University demographic data do suggest that some units in the College are recruiting young faculty of color more effectively now than they had in the past. In 2011 such faculty constituted 27% of the total assistant professor population, compared to 19% in 2005. Moreover, this is a higher percentage than is the case with either senior rank (15%, full professor; 24%, associate professor). We thus conclude that there are more minority faculty in the pipeline because some units are actively and successfully recruiting them. What also seems clear is that race/ethnicity and, to a lesser extent, gender, are the two major constitutive dimensions of diversity when it comes to faculty recruitment. We see no evidence that other dimensions of identity factor actively in unit hiring decisions, and whether faculty who self-identify on the basis of non-normative sexualities, religion, class, ability/disability are recruited/hired is very much a local matter. Whether they should be warrants discussion with and within units.

**Recruitment and Retention Recommendations**

**Undergraduate & Graduate Students**

1. Develop recruitment programs and outreach efforts to encourage underrepresented students to pursue a degree and career in the arts and humanities disciplines. This should be coordinated between the College and departments. Both levels should enlist the support of faculty in the recruitment process, and coordinate high school or college visits that will hopefully yield an academically talented and diverse group of students with outreach to Maryland schools.

2. Departments need to continue working with the College on outreach to students below 2.3 and/or in academic jeopardy.

3. Examine and develop our enrichment opportunities and issues of access to ensure we are attracting and retaining a high achieving and diverse group of students.

4. Look at special populations with the lowest retention rates and implement strategies to improve success rate.

5. Engage faculty in teaching first and second year students; being intentional about mentoring students of color, first generation students, and students with disabilities; and encouraging more to do research, pursue graduate studies, and apply for scholarships and fellowships.

6. Develop community-building opportunities so that all students feel included in the department and the college.

7. Examine the curriculum to determine if it’s inclusive of issues of diversity. Explore ways of being intentional about including diverse perspectives into the curriculum.

8. Hire more faculty of color as well as faculty that represent other underrepresented populations.

9. The College should coordinate various forms of assessment to determine the needs of the students, as well as benchmarking to explore best practices from our peers.
10. Design and implement graduating student surveys to capture student impressions of their experiences and their recommendations for enhancing their experiences, especially regarding diversity, inclusion, and equity.

11. The Dean and her staff should discuss with unit heads the University-level impediments they face when they have tried to recruit students of color and other underrepresented students. This is probably most critical at the undergraduate level.

Staff

1. At the College level, a staff member should work with personnel to understand current sources of staff and brainstorm ways to expand staff pools and create incentives to recruit staff to the college. Unit heads will likely need to be brought into these discussions and plan development.

2. Again, at the College level, provide systematic training for chairs, directors, and other supervisors so that they can explore ways of addressing issues of diversity as well as ways of developing a healthy climate for staff.

3. At both the College and unit levels, develop intentional community-building initiatives.

4. Include within annual reviews (PRD), discussions with and recommendations from staff about diversity, inclusion, and equity.

5. Design and implement exit surveys to capture staff impressions of their experiences and their recommendations for enhancing their experiences, especially regarding diversity, inclusion, and equity.

6. The Dean should discuss with unit heads the budgetary issues and needs related to the recruitment and retention of more staff from underrepresented groups.

Faculty

1. The Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs should prepare an annual review and assessment of faculty hiring and promotion/tenure processes and share with unit heads the diversity-related data and conclusions from this review, as well as recommendations for enhancing promotion and retention.

2. The Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, in concert with department chairs, should develop diversity training, workshops, and conversations that are designed to challenge chairs, faculty, and departments to think about diversity and inclusion related to recruitment and retention of faculty, students, and staff of color and other underrepresented groups.

3. The College leadership and department chairs should continue to support and actively engage with the ADVANCE initiative, and encourage their women faculty to participate. Should the ADVANCE initiative come to an end, the College and chairs should decide best practices to continue.

4. Insofar as recruitment of faculty is traditionally tied to intellectual and/or research areas of focus, Department chairs and faculties should have extensive discussions about where, intellectually, their fields/disciplines are going and should go and employ this information in developing intentional efforts to recruit, hire, and retain underrepresented faculty. Such information should also be useful in the recruitment of
students and staff. To facilitate these discussions, we provide a template in Appendix C (“Research & Scholarship Questions”).

5. The Dean should meet with chairs about current practices in their units that pertain to promoting diversity and inclusion and set goals.

6. Academic departments should engage in diversity and inclusion benchmarking and research best practices for addressing issues of diversity for peer programs.

Curriculum, Instruction, and Programming
The Dean’s charge to the TF directed us to review diversity courses in the general education programs. After reviewing diversity courses submitted for the new general education program as well as College and academic websites, the TF concluded that departmental commitments to diversity were mixed. Not all units submitted diversity courses to the new General Education program for either diversity-related category (Plural Societies or Cultural Competence), and few had as clear a diversity statement on their websites as did the College. Especially after the focus group conversations, however, the TF concluded that academic programs need to make diversity and inclusion intentional in teaching and learning across the curriculum to realize them in all that we do. Thus, to talk about diversity in the context of the curriculum and instruction without mentioning the curriculum beyond General Education, diversity courses would be a grave omission. None of us on the Task Force presumes to know enough to suggest whether departmental curricula have infused, acted on, and integrated diversity across the board. But we do think that this is a discussion that departments should have, and ideally such discussions will be about what they should be teaching down the road, five or ten years out, and will lead to discussions both about who their students will/should be and about who will be on the faculty (templates in Appendix C).

Curriculum, Instruction, and Programming Recommendations:

1. The College and its units should make diversity and inclusion explicit, intentional, and common dimensions of all curricular, co-curricular, and programmatic initiatives.

2. The College and its units should establish and articulate specific statements about what we want students to learn about diversity, how we should prepare them to deal with diversity in their education and daily lives, and incorporate diversity content throughout the curriculum. To this end, the College office and units should develop diversity and inclusion statements for their websites and include questions related to diversity and inclusion, both about course content and instruction, in course evaluations.

3. All academic units should contribute diversity courses for the General Education program.

4. The College should encourage and support units and faculty that pursue community outreach and engaged scholarship.

5. Departments should include student input in all forms and levels of curricular and program planning.

6. Departments should create co-curricular opportunities to explore diversity (e.g., credit-bearing colloquia, conversations with Dean’s Lecture series speakers, small group interactions, interdisciplinary exchanges).

7. The College office and units should work together to ensure that instruction, mentoring,
and advising accommodate multiple learning styles among both undergraduate and graduate students. The College might consider funding forums on pedagogy and classroom methods, in concert with knowledgeable faculty and CTE.

8. Department chairs should encourage and provide incentives for faculty to take advantage of CTE resources on teaching and learning and support faculty who collaborate with colleagues in other units in developing diversity and inclusion training.

**Impediments**

In the course of our data gathering and many meetings and conversations, we have identified a number of impediments that may affect the implementation of this report. Chief among these are (a) the lack of funds and (b) faculty and, perhaps to a lesser extent, staff ambivalence or even resistance. We are aware that one of the critical issues not addressed so far is salary compression, which we know is becoming a major problem within units and a source of inequity. Only increased funding is going to resolve this one, but without resolution, support for hiring more new faculty with diverse backgrounds is going to be resisted in some faculty quarters. Given that many of our units are very poor already and, when possible, are cobbling together vacant lines to meet expenses, they are also going to be hard pressed to find money to expand hiring pools, which will likely be necessary for increasing racial/ethnic and gender diversity. And new funds will be needed to enhance faculty, staff, and student recruitment and retention.

Faculty and staff ambivalence or resistance may be as significant an impediment as is insufficient funding. We all know people who have heavy loads and will resist one more task, which is almost inevitable given some of the recommendations in this report. Even more critical perhaps is the anticipated faculty fallback position: “we have to follow trends in the discipline.” The TF chair encountered several instances of this attitude when she talked with chairs of academic units and their advisory bodies about recruiting faculty and students of colors. These discussions and even sentiments expressed in the TF do indicate further that getting people to understand that achieving greater diversity among their students, staff, and faculty will depend at least to some extent on what they teach and that broadening conceptions of their fields is not going to be an easy or short-term task. The Dean may even have to work with chairs and directors in developing strategies for overcoming faculty ambivalence and resistance to doing some of the things we think will need to be done but do not fall under the headings of research or teaching.

**Final Thoughts**

The Dean was absolutely right when she appointed this TF and charged it with examining diversity throughout the College and suggesting recommended actions. There is no doubt that diversity is absolutely critical for the future of the College, its units, and its members. The rationale goes beyond the obvious point that the “face” of the state and nation have changed and will continue to change, quite dramatically, in the coming years. The larger goal really is about creating a more inclusive and equitable environment, to which diversity is key, and from which real excellence will build.
This report will likely leave the impression that the Dean and the College community have a lot of work to do to make the College a diverse, inclusive, and equitable unit. They do. We have no doubt, however, that the Dean is the right person to tackle the challenge and that she will succeed. We also have no doubt that she will have a lot of help implementing and probably both refining and expanding the recommendations we have provided. She will. We have encountered many members of the College who support the goals of diversity, inclusion, and equity, but are frustrated by the slow and few changes achieved in the past. They are willing to lend a hand to set things “right.” The Dean should have no doubt that a critical mass of people know that we are “all in this together” and are willing to work with her to get this done this time.
College Implementation

The following outlines goals, objectives and actions in accordance with the three goals set forth in the University’s strategic diversity plan, which are:

**Goal 1**
To ensure policies and structures are in place at all levels of the University to support transformational leadership, recruitment, and inclusion efforts, and to institutionalize campus diversity goals. **We will provide the leadership and infrastructure needed to create a more diverse and inclusive population in the College of Arts and Humanities.**

**Goal 2**
To foster a positive climate that promotes student success and encourages faculty and staff members to flourish. **We will create a College climate in which diversity, inclusion and equity are valued and realized at both the College and Unit levels throughout the College of Arts and Humanities.**

**Goal 3**
To promote a vision across the University that fully appreciates diversity as a core value and educational benefit to be studied, cultivated, and embraced as a vital component of personal development and growth. **We will diversify academic programs by making diversity and inclusion intentional in teaching and learning across the curriculum of the College of Arts and Humanities.**

**SELECTED TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS AND ARHU ACTIONS**

**LEADERSHIP**

**Recommendations**

1. **In a more stable economic climate, the Dean might appoint a full-time Associate Dean for Diversity, Inclusion and Equity;** Short term, the dean’s senior staff should assume responsibility for diversity, inclusion and equity appropriate to individual portfolios.
2. **Dean’s senior staff and unit head statements of diversity responsibility;** include in PRDs and/or appointment letter.
3. **Unit heads should assume responsibility for ensuring that diversity, inclusion and equity are active principles guiding programs;** including curriculum, research and scholarship, outreach, professional development, hiring, recruitment and retention.
4. **Unit heads should complete an annual review of IRPA data;** results should be incorporated into programmatic diversity and inclusion goals.
5. **Unit heads should engage unit faculty, staff and students in conversations** about content, direction and beneficiaries of their programs five and ten years; to facilitate conversations, see template in Appendix C.

**ARHU Actions 2013-14**

1. Diversity and inclusion goals and actions are incorporated in the responsibilities of each member of the Dean’s senior staff.
2. Unit heads have been tasked with reviewing and using IRPA diversity data for their unit to
develop diversity goals to be accomplished as part of their yearly goals.
3. Unit heads will provide leadership in promoting conversations among faculty, staff and students about diversity and inclusion as it relates to curriculum and hiring.
4. The dean will provide incentives to units in efforts to increase hiring of underrepresented minorities.

**INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Recommendations**

1. **Provide systematic training, workshops, and conversations for administrators, unit heads**, supervisors and faculty to discuss best practices and campus policies about diversity, inclusion and equity.
2. **Provide significant financial support** for activities likely to increase the success of minority members of the University community. Discussion of retention and recruitment of staff and the financial issues with unit heads.
3. **Align promotion and merit with diversity practices** of College and campus. Include discussions of diversity in annual PRDs.
4. **Provide systematic, formal mentoring** with appropriate incentives and rewards for faculty, staff and students.
5. **Support community-building** activities within College. Community building opportunities so that faculty, staff and students feel included in both the department and College community.
6. **Work with facilities officials** to ensure full access to buildings and rooms around campus.
7. **Work with OIT** to ensure assistive technologies and alternative media are available to those who need them.

**ARHU Actions 2013-14**

1. The Dean’s Office and units will provide workshops and professional development opportunities for administrators, unit heads, faculty and staff about best practices and campus policies for diversity, inclusion, and equity.
2. Although expectations for and recognition of diversity and inclusion related practices are part of our hiring procedures, strategies to enhance and strengthen these efforts will be developed and enacted.
3. The Dean’s Office is encouraging and supporting community-building activities for faculty, staff and students within all units of the College.
4. Work with campus facilities officials and the Division of Technology continues to ensure full access to buildings, rooms and teaching resources.
5. The Dean’s Office continues to consider the diversity profile and efforts to enhance the profile of graduate programs as a factor in fellowship allocation to units.
6. Implementation of ARHU Staff Council has begun.
7. The Dean’s Office and units will develop and implement formal faculty mentoring for the College to ensure that each unit provides a robust mentoring plan.

**CLIMATE**

**Recommendations**

1. **Commission the Office of Diversity and Inclusion** to conduct a comprehensive climate survey to identify and plan for College best practices to be delivered via the dean’s office. Identify additional forms of assessment to determine needs of students and benchmark against peers.
2. **Develop and implement graduating student surveys** to capture student experience and recommendations for enhancement especially regarding issues of diversity and inclusion.
3. **Design and implement exit surveys** to capture staff and faculty impressions of their experiences and recommendations for enhancing experience.
4. **Incorporate student input** in all forms and levels of curricular program planning.
5. **Instruction, mentoring and advising** should accommodate multiple learning styles among undergraduate and graduate students.

**ARHU Actions 2013-14**
1. The Dean’s Office will review and analyze data such as the UMD career center exit survey, IRPA and national data for ARHU graduating seniors to learn more about student experience.
2. The Dean’s Office will develop and implement a graduate student survey to include questions about diversity experiences.
3. The Dean’s Office will develop and implement web enabled and face-to-face staff exit survey instruments that include information about diversity experiences.
4. The Dean’s Office in collaboration with the ADVANCE Professor will review and analyze the ADVANCE survey on faculty satisfaction and determine appropriate action.
5. Over one year, the Dean’s Office will conduct unit-by-unit discussions with faculty about faculty affairs, including APT, diversity/inclusion and mentoring.

**RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION**

**Recommendations**

**Undergraduate & Graduate Students**
1. **Examine issues of access** and develop enrichment opportunities to ensure recruitment and retention of high achieving, diverse students; research and discuss University-level impediments.
2. **Coordinate and develop recruitment programs** and outreach efforts between College and departments to encourage under-represented students to pursue degrees and careers in arts and humanities. Enlist faculty in recruitment process; coordinate visits that yield academically talented, diverse students specifically from Maryland.
3. **Continue College-level undergraduate retention program** and coordinate with departments. Examine special populations with low retention and implement strategies to improve success rates.
4. **Encourage faculty to work with and mentor** first and second year students, first generation, disabled and students of color; encourage graduate studies; help apply for scholarships and fellowships; engage in research.

**Staff**
1. **Develop plan to discuss and expand staff pools** for College units.
2. **Within annual reviews (PRDs), include discussion and recommendations** from staff about diversity, inclusion and equity.

**Faculty**
1. **Annual review and assessment of faculty hiring**, promotion and tenure processes; share recommendations with unit heads.
2. **Develop plan to recruit, hire and retain** more faculty of color as well as faculty that represent other under-represented populations.
3. **Support/engage ADVANCE** initiative to encourage women to participate and continue best practices if initiative is dissolved.
ARHU Actions 2013-14
1. Enhance undergraduate recruitment and retention initiatives to provide intentional outreach to underrepresented populations both at the College and unit level to include special programming, strategic advising and partnerships both on and off campus.
2. The Dean’s Office will provide special recruitment funds for travel and campus visits to underrepresented minority graduate students.
3. The Dean’s Office will convene faculty within rank to facilitate networking and communities of support.
4. The Dean’s Office will continue to support and promote the ADVANCE initiative across all units.

CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTION AND PLANNING
Recommendations
1. Examine curriculum to determine if it is inclusive of issues of diversity; explore ways to be intentional about including diverse perspectives into the curriculum.
2. Intentional inclusion of diversity in curricular, co-curricular and programmatic initiatives.
3. Establish and communicate a diversity statement on the web about what we want students to learn about diversity; how we prepare them to deal with diversity in their education and daily lives.
4. Develop plan to contribute diversity courses for general education program.
5. Encourage faculty to take advantage of CTE resources on teaching and learning and support faculty who collaborate with colleagues in other units in developing diversity and inclusion training.
6. Unit heads and faculty conversations about intellectual direction of programs and implications for hiring diverse faculty; engage in diversity benchmarking and research best practices for peer programs; tie to recruitment of students, faculty and staff.

ARHU Actions 2013-14
1. Units will engage in discussion of curriculum as it relates to diversity content and student populations.

OUTREACH AND ENGAGED RESEARCH
Recommendations
1. Encourage innovation in research, teaching and public service focused on equity, inclusion and diversity; particularly for work that connects faculty and student research to external communities.

ARHU Actions 2013-14
1. The College launched the Foxworth Creative Enterprise Initiative, a classroom-based, social-innovation program that provides UMD students with an opportunity to apply the knowledge and skills of the arts and humanities in a collaborative working relationship with underrepresented communities.
2. Unit heads will facilitate constructive conversations among faculty about diversity and inclusion as it relates to curriculum and research that connects faculty and students to the external community.
Appendix A: ARHU IRPA Data

1. ARHU Data Pie Charts: % Race and Ethnicity 2012
2. Instructors and Lecturers: % Race, Ethnicity and Gender 2005-2012
3. Exempt Staff: % Race, Ethnicity and Gender 2005-2012
4. Non-Exempt Staff: % Race, Ethnicity and Gender 2005-2012
5. Graduate Students: % Race, Ethnicity and Gender 2005-2012
6. Undergraduate Student: % Race, Ethnicity and Gender 2005-2012
7. Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty: 3 College Comparison % Race, Ethnicity 2010-2012 and Gender 2008-2012
8. Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty: ARHU/UMD Comparison % Race, Ethnicity 2005-2012
9. Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty: ARHU/UMD Comparison % Gender 2005-2012

Note: For more information on this data, please contact Nicky Everette at meve@umd.edu or 301.405.6714.
Appendix B: Focus Group Questions and Themes

Student Sessions

Questions for Undergraduate Students (2 sessions)

1. What is your experience in the College of Arts and Humanities with regard to diversity? Do you think your fellow students have (had) similar experiences?
2. How has diversity in ARHU affected your academic experiences, if at all?
3. Have you been treated differently here in the College of Arts and Humanities that you believe was based on your identity such as race, gender, sexual orientation, etc. and if so, how?
4. How have ARHU-sponsored efforts (those by faculty, administrators, and student organizations) helped with regards to community building and diversity? What else can we do?

Questions for Graduate Students

1. What does Diversity mean to you?
2. What is your experience in the College of Arts and Humanities with regard to diversity?
3. Do you think your fellow students have (had) similar experiences?
4. Have you been treated differently here in the College of Arts and Humanities that you believe was based on your identity such as race, gender, sexual orientation, etc. and if so, how?
5. How have ARHU-sponsored efforts (those by faculty, administrators, and student organizations) helped with regards to community building and diversity? What else can we do?

General themes and ideas that emerged from the conversations:

- Develop a college definition for the role of diversity in the ARHU curriculum—in addition to CORE and GENED.
- Establish and articulate goals, expectations and definitions of success at both a micro and macro level to ensure initiatives are designed to meet desired outcomes (e.g. What do we want students to learn about diversity, How should we prepare students to handle issues of diversity in their education and daily lives? etc.)
- Create an infrastructure that includes follow through and support of initiatives (e.g. credit-bearing experiences, stipends, assessment, reward/credit for promotion, faculty/new faculty training...make it “part of the job”)
- Intentional inclusion of student (undergraduate and graduate) input on all levels of diversity planning and initiatives
- More exploration needed on student’s perception of diversity in their ARHU experience—the classroom, the curriculum (e.g. issues of being the “only one”, lack of mentors that reflect diversity in the student body, challenges students face as a result of identity, etc.)
Create faculty, TA, staff education/training opportunities on dealing with issues of diversity. This includes how to handle classroom dynamics as well as ways of infusing “diversity” into the curriculum.

Create co-curricular opportunities to explore diversity—in more detail
  ➢ More time for students to engage with visiting artist and guest speakers (e.g. follow up conversations with Dean’s Lecture series speakers)
  ➢ Small group interactions that foster opportunities for conversation on topics of diversity (e.g. Lunch series)
  ➢ Credit bearing colloquia (e.g. “ARHU Intergroup Dialogs”)
  ➢ Create more opportunities for interdisciplinary exchange of ideas and methods—can also be credit bearing

Educate the college community on what is already being done on issues associated with diversity so that everyone is in the loop (e.g. Global Engagement Requirement, Dean’s Lecture series, departmental programs and initiatives etc.)

Questions for Staff (8 participants, both exempt and non-exempt)

1. What does diversity mean to you?
2. What is your experience in the College of Arts and Humanities with regards to diversity? Do you think others have had similar experiences?
3. Can you think of situations in the College in which dimensions of identity such as; race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, (dis)ability, and so on have been a factor positively or negatively?
4. To what extent do issues of diversity affect your workplace and equity?
5. To what extent is diversity being addressed in your field?
6. Do you believe that certain groups have been marginalized in the college or in your unit?
7. How have ARHU sponsored efforts (those by faculty, staff, administrators and student organizations) helped with regards to community building and diversity? What else can we do?
8. Is there something you wish I’d asked that I didn’t?

General themes and ideas that emerged from the conversation:

• Diversity means inclusiveness, respect for differences, ability to retain difference.
• Unit commitment to and people’s experiences with diversity varies across the College. What one experiences, for better or worse, depends on where one works. Diversity hasn’t been intentional at the College level. Some units are not diverse at all.
• Across the staff, there’s a preponderance of women. Is the College recruiting men? Are women earning livable wages?
• Diversity is broader than gender or race. Staff themselves recognize multiple characteristics, differences. Some differences do matter in some spaces, while in others staff members just don’t discuss differences that will divide people.
• Staff are often taken for granted and are considered below everyone else. Staff are considered inferior to faculty and have few opportunities to take advantage of benefits...
(e.g., tuition remission). Exempt staff are accorded more flexibility than are non-exempt staff. Non-exempt staff are clearly most marginalized and are considered "non-professional"

- Support identified for the new Staff Council. They want to get out of their "silos" and would enjoy being part of a College community.
- Expressed concern for "giving people a chance." Want more opportunities for themselves to grow and learn new skills and for students, especially those who don’t come from "best" schools.
- Would like to see diversity training expanded, including training for diversity officers.

Questions for Faculty (10 participants, all ranks, across the College)

1. What does diversity mean to you?
2. What is your experience in the College of Arts and Humanities with regards to diversity? Do you think others have had similar experiences?
3. Can you think of situations in the College in which dimensions of identity such as; race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, (dis)ability, and so on have been a factor positively or negatively?
4. To what extent are issues of diversity included in your curriculum?
5. To what extent is diversity being addressed in your field?
6. Do you believe that certain groups have been marginalized in the college or in your unit?
7. How have ARHU sponsored efforts (those by faculty, staff, administrators and student organizations) helped with regards to community building and diversity? What else can we do?
8. Is there something you wish I’d asked that I didn’t?

General themes and ideas that emerged from the conversation:

- Diversity means inclusiveness; considers cultural characteristics and dimensions rather than just demographic categories.
- Only some units in the College are expected to “do” diversity.
- The most incredible diversity is among students. They have “lived” diversity and are more comfortable with a broad range of people, views, experiences that are some faculty.
- In some places, it is challenging for faculty who are brought in to be “diversity,” especially when broader attitudes aren’t changing and other bodies aren’t evident. Compared to students, faculty diversity is not as broad or dynamic.
- Commitment to hiring more diverse faculty varies across departments. Often diversity loses out to directions in the “field,” and departments keep hiring in the same subfields where there’s no diversity.
- Single or small numbers of “diversity” faculty have tough times in some units. There can be little support, little effort to create bridges across units, few synergies within a unit.
- Collaboration and community building across department lines needs to be made easier and encouraged.
- In some places, mentoring of young and of minority faculty is often mediocre at best,
because mentors are unprepared. Are any resources put into mentoring? Mentors need broad training and a range of knowledge, for issues young faculty have range from not knowing what questions to ask to asking how to respond to a full professor who says one’s area is invalid. There probably need to be multiple mentors, both in and outside of a department/program.

- Overall, the College is a siloed place. In some places, there appears to be little valuing of, time for, or funds for collaboration. College could find ways to cross the silos but hasn’t done so.
- In some places, there is also no support for team teaching in what is a very bureaucratic, structured place. The same statement applies to interdisciplinarity. There is a lot of lip service but no facilitation, rewards, or resources in places.
- Some departments think outside the box on many issues, while others don’t. Some departments may bring in different faces but they want those faces to do exactly the same things as the department has been doing.
- In some places, the maintenance of a Eurocentric canon and base for values is clear, in terms of curriculum and course content, texts, journals, presses, etc. The University strategy of building on existing strengths doesn’t help this tendency. Some departments won’t even have a discussion of diversifying the canon.
- The cultures in some departments are critical, even determinative as to whether diversity matters. In some departments, faculty and students of color are just marginalized, and there are different standards for women and minorities.
- At present this isn’t a very welcoming place.
- Leadership needs to come from the college and at the department level to make diversity be a viable dimension of everyday life.
- Diversity is every one’s job.
Appendix C -- Templates for Departments Use

Template 1 -- Research/Scholarship questions:

What may be the big, driving research questions in your discipline/field/area in the next five years? In ten years?

What consequences for your research/scholarship do you anticipate given projected US population shifts and continued global/transnational dynamism?

How will you structure your research enterprise in five years? Ten Years? What themes or focus areas do you anticipate?

In what forms will research/scholarship be communicated in five years? Ten years?

What areas of expertise will you expect of new hires in five years? Ten years?

Who will make-up your hiring pool? If it’s not as broad or deep as you’d like it to be, or as diverse as your students may be, what are you going to do?

Template 2 -- Curriculum questions:

What will be likely consequences of scholarship developments, projected US population shifts, and continued global/transnational movements for your curriculum in the next five years? Ten years?

Who will be your students, both undergraduates and graduates, in the next five years? Ten years?

What will your introductory courses look like? What will you be teaching students? What should they learn?

What will more advanced courses look like?

Who will be teaching your students in five years? Ten years? Will your students see faces like their own among your faculty?

What other experiences will your students likely need/want in five years? Ten years? How are you going to provide them?
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The following are recommendations made by the college’s diversity task force, organized by the university’s three strategic diversity goals:

**Goal 1 (One Page)**

To ensure policies and structures are in place at all levels of the college to support transformational leadership, recruitment, and inclusion efforts, and to institutionalize campus diversity goals;

The college will commit the resources of the dean’s office (facilities, services, budget, and practices) to realizing diversity.

- Long term we would like to appoint a full time associate dean for Diversity, Inclusion and Equity; Short term, the dean’s senior staff will assume responsibility for diversity appropriate to portfolios (BTD).
- Dean’s senior staff statements of diversity responsibility/evaluation in PRDs; composition of committees, unit searches, curriculum, research/scholarship, community engagement and outreach, finance. (dean’s senior staff)
- Chairs and directors statement of diversity responsibilities as related to curriculum, scholarship/research, outreach, professional development, hiring, and recruitment; review/include IRPA data and engage unit faculty/staff/students in subunit plan. (chairs, directors)

**Goal 2**

To foster a positive climate that promotes student success and encourages faculty and staff members to flourish;

The college will foster a diverse, inclusive and equal community.

- Commission ODI to conduct comprehensive climate survey to identify and plan for college best practices to be delivered via the dean’s office.
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