

ANNUAL REPORT
2015-16
Community, Equity, and Diversity Initiative
Carleton College

Submitted July 18, 2016 by CEDI Co-Chairs:

Mary Amy, Development Operations Coordinator

Adriana Estill, Associate Professor of American Studies and English

I. Summary

2015-16 marks the seventh year of Carleton's CEDI, formed the year after the campus climate survey. Early annual reports detail CEDI's focus on resolving issues that the campus climate survey made visible and emphasized. But, as the action team on CEDI structure and functionality suggests, in recent years, CEDI has suffered some structural problems, including that it lacks "direction and falls short of outlining clear responsibilities for the committee" and its "purpose hasn't been clear for some members of the committee itself or the larger campus." In response, our central focus this year has been to assess CEDI's work and figure out how to position it as a proactive rather than reactive body on campus.¹

Early meetings between the co-chairs and in conversation with Tuesday group led to the development of three action teams centered around the following areas:

- CEDI Structure and Functionality: It seemed urgent and necessary to review CEDI's own structural position, historical function, and whether its current work met the community's needs;
- Faculty Diversity Training: In the wake of student activism that demands this training, we wanted to learn more about what students hoped said training would accomplish (i.e. we wanted to understand better the roots of discontent as well as build more concrete knowledge that would help us contribute to potential training models).
- Carleton Culture: As part of a proactive strategy, we wanted one team to study how Carleton builds community publicly [the website, our policies, our mission, our diversity statement, etc.] to assess how inclusive we're being there.

Staffing the various action teams took time, but all three had begun work by the end of Fall term. Reports were received from each action team by the end of the year; this report details their findings in the next section.

In addition to CEDI's action team work, the Leadership Board had its own goals. We kept the group small this year, recognizing our transitional status and in anticipation of change that would follow the report of the structure and functionality team. We instituted and tried to formalize more frequent meetings,

¹ While CEDI strived to be more proactive, we want to recognize the "reactive" work done by last year's CEDI (the Black Lives Matter panel and the Chili lunches). These events were well attended and appreciated by the community.

recognizing that CEDI serves as an important informational node and these meetings play a role in maintaining lines of communication. We worked to innovate minute taking, with the goal of doing our work with transparency and accountability.

If you look at our “Fall Ramp Up” memo (Appendix One), the list of “things we’re keeping an eye on” proved to be accurate, particularly our attention to diversity training across the college and our continued conversations about what the website should be and look like. Other issues developed throughout the year, in particular some discussions of ESAG and its work on easing name choice for students; conversations around BIRT; changes in the sexual misconduct policy; restorative justice; how to best support transgender staff and faculty (an issue that we highlighted to Tuesday Group and action was taken from there); and the community conversations initiative led by Carolyn Livingston.

As in previous years, Carleton has not lacked for complicated and vexed conversations around race, gender, sexuality, class, and difference. CEDI was attentive to and, in some cases, individuals representing CEDI counseled individuals involved in the following Campus issues: the continuing aftermath of the hate-speech tweet and the development of the Facilitated Conversations student group (now named SEED); continued conversations about a cappella membership; controversies and conversations about the dance group Ebony (name and history); Facebook arguments about race; controversy and conversations about *Tales of Rashomon* and the representation of Asian students.

II. Action teams

Three action teams were constituted and, by the end of fall term, were staffed and in motion. Communication was generally consistent and frequent with all the action teams, facilitated by the fact that each action team contained at least one Leadership Board member.

The CEDI Structure and Functionality action team was led by Carolyn Fure-Slocum, Matt Rand, and Mikki Showers. They were asked to work through and present ideas for how CEDI might be structured best for Carleton’s current needs. Questions they were urged to consider included: is CEDI structured in the best way that it can be? Is it as functional as it could be? What should be its key mission and priorities and what kind of committee structure and reporting chain make sense for that? We encouraged the action team to sift through CEDI’s history (examining annual reports, the revised mission / charge statement (2013), and talking to past CEDI co-chairs as well as colleagues who have had more continuous service on CEDI).

The action team provided useful end of term Fall and Winter verbal reports as well as ongoing drafts of their suggestions throughout the spring term. Conversations with the Leadership board led to the report, endorsed by the Leadership board, that comprises **Appendix Two**. Tuesday Group offered a few revisions; CEDI took this revised report to College Council where it was soundly endorsed. (See **Appendix Three**.)

Summary of changes: The new structure aims to provide better communication and feedback between CEDI and college leadership, in part through the designation of a CEDI advisor who supports and works

with the CEDI co-chairs. New CEDI will be larger and will have a public schedule that will help it gather information and provide consistent forums.

The Faculty Diversity Training action team was led by Anita Chikkatur and Pierre Hecker, and included Laura Haave and students Stephanie Lee and Margot Radding. Their charge was to better understand what students *mean when they ask for training*. We asked them to figure out what students hope is accomplished by faculty diversity training and how they imagine that their experience in the classroom or in other faculty-student interactions would change?

We asked them to gather this information by having conversations with a “*broad and representative* sampling of students across Carleton campus”. After some difficulty in figuring out how to best proceed, this action team was paired with Andrea Nixon, who held a number of focus groups at the beginning of spring term and provided a thorough (and thoroughly useful) report. (Nixon’s report has also been circulated to Friday group.) Using that information as well as other data gathered, the group submitted a focused set of recommendations for faculty diversity training (**Appendix Four**). These recommendations have been forwarded to the President of the faculty and Friday group to aid them in their organization of a Faculty retreat centered on diversity and inclusion.

Summary of outcomes. Data gathered by and through this action team has circulated to a number of invested college parties. In particular, the Faculty retreat’s design and process (focused on diversity and inclusion) has benefited.

The **Carleton Culture** action team was charged with a very large task--examining and assessing how Carleton builds community publicly. This group was deliberately large and diverse, with representatives from faculty, exempt staff, bi-weekly staff, union staff, and students. Led by Laska Jimsen (faculty) and David Wiles (faculty), the team included staff members Aaron Chaput, Leanne Ellison, Joy Kluttz, and Sara Nielsen, and students Serena Chalaka and Anne Hamilton. The size of the group did seem to make it less responsive, but the work they did was sizeable. The primary task we asked from them was to look at the Carleton website and core landing pages and see whether they demonstrate Carleton's commitment to diversity (or whether there are ways in which they make crucial errors in that commitment). Their report (**Appendix Five**) addresses this charge. They also decided to begin the important work of considering the College's Diversity Statement. This work should be continued.

Summary of report. The report strongly suggests reworking the diversity statement, and provides a collection of thoughts about various web pages. There are some local suggestions, which will be sent to the appropriate parties.

III. Suggestions for next year CEDI work

- Possible action team foci: researching other college’s diversity statement and rewriting our own; help assess campus climate (socioeconomic issues).
- Build and have prominently on our website a “diversity map” with resources clearly outlined and understood in relation. Diversity maps are currently being developed and used in various institutions as a way to better understand what institutions already have, what they need, where the gaps are, and how to improve communication between the various areas.

- Ongoing training in relevant areas for CEDI co-chairs, with a focus on figuring out how to schedule these trainings.
- Public announcement of CEDI co-chairs by administration.
- Improve relationship between president's office and CEDI co-chairs, in particular by providing co-chairs with access to technology resources (email, website) and to student work time.

Appendix One: Beginning of Year Memo to Tuesday Group and Action Team Charges

CEDI 2015 Fall Ramp-up

Co-chairs: Adriana Estill and Mary Amy

2015-16 Agenda:

- Action teams constituted (see next page for charges):
 - CEDI Structure and Functionality (Carolyn Furé-Slocum, Matt Rand, Mikki Showers, students to be appointed)
 - Faculty Diversity Training (Anita Chikkatur, Pierre Hecker, students to be appointed by CSA)
 - Carleton Culture (Laska Jimsen, David Wiles, students to be appointed by CSA; staff appointments still to be made)
- Ombuds person - continue discussions started in 2013-14 about fair and responsible ombuds placement and practices

Things we're keeping an eye on:

- Diversity training initiatives at student, faculty, and staff levels
- Discussions on community concern forms
- Community norms/codes of conduct/language around what we expect from members in our community
- Our website -- how best to organize it; what should be linked here and what should be housed here; how to make CEDI more visible and relevant to the community
- Initiatives by the LTC: building up roster of faculty mentors in area of classroom diversity
- Initiative by Deanna: first-gen faculty stories on video
- TRIO search
- Initiative of "Friday group": teaching resources (w/r/t diversity) collected and to be housed at LTC website
- Campus-wide reading group on Ta-Nehisi Coates's memoir next term (led by Jeff O and Clara H)
- Green Dot initiative (GSC)

Areas for feedback right now:

- Standing 5 min. slot at faculty meetings? At every FORUM meeting? (Already report at every SAC meeting.)
- Any hires that we should be aware of? (Early CEDI was involved in making sure departments worked to diversify applicant pool.)

Action Team Charges

CEDI Structure and Functionality:

Is CEDI structured in the best way that it can be? Is it as functional as it could be? What should be its key mission and priorities and what kind of committee structure and reporting chain make sense for that?

Subquestions that you might consider: Post-climate survey, how does CEDI choose and prioritize next steps? Do we need a new charge? Is CEDI campus visibility important? How does the composition of the Leadership board affect communication and follow-through?

We imagine (though this part is up to you) that you'll first examine the history of CEDI, both through looking at annual reports, the revised mission / charge statement (2013), and talking to past CEDI co-chairs as well as folks who have had more continuous service on CEDI (like Julie Thornton). Other steps that might prove useful/necessary are: pinpointing strengths and weaknesses of CEDI--what have been the failures and what can we attribute them to? looking at successful committees--is the reporting and action tree differently organized? reviewing what we expect and need CEDI to do.

Because Carolyn will be sitting on the leadership board, your action team will be well-represented at our meetings. More formally, hopefully at the end of fall and winter terms you will have progress reports and at the end of spring term a set of suggestions. These reports will give the leadership board a chance to review and, if necessary, ask you to redirect your work.

Faculty Diversity Training:

You'll be working with a student activist group (begun in the wake of their conversations last year). While their goal is simply to get training started, CEDI's goal is to better understand what students *mean when they ask for training*. To put this into question form, your charge is to figure out:

- what do students hope is accomplished by faculty diversity training?
- how do they imagine that their experience in the classroom or in other faculty-student interactions would change?
- what IS happening in the classroom; i.e. what are the concrete microaggressions that have led to the students' demands?

We imagine that you'll do this work by, in tandem with students, having conversations with a *broad and representative* sampling of students across Carleton campus. We'll be looking to receive progress reports from you at the ends of fall and winter terms and, at the end of spring term, a summative report and, hopefully, a set of suggestions. The midpoint reports will give the leadership board a chance to review and, if necessary, ask you to redirect your work.

Carleton Culture:

The CEDI action team that you'll be a part of (on "Carleton Culture") has the most deliberately vague parameters, but the charge is at the core of CEDI work. Look around at how Carleton builds community publicly [the website, our policies, our mission, our diversity statement, etc.] and assess how inclusive we're being. Because this is a humongous charge, Mary and I have a couple of suggestions for the particularities of your work this year:

- We want to know whether the Carleton website and core landing pages demonstrate Carleton's commitment to diversity (or whether there are ways in which they make crucial errors in that commitment).
- We want to know what falls under the "diversity" umbrella at Carleton and whether CEDI's corner of the website should "house" it or just link to it.

You'll be working with others, so you don't have to do this work alone, but Mary and I are still gathering the crew with whom you'll work. We want this action team to make sure it includes representatives from faculty, exempt staff, bi-weekly staff, union staff, and students.

Appendix Two: Report from the Structure and Functionality of CEDI Action Team
(delivered April 13 2016)

CEDI Structure and Functionality Action Team Recommendations ---DRAFT #11
History, structure, and purposes of the Diversity Initiative Group (DIG) and The Community, Equity, and Diversity Initiative (CEDI)

The Diversity Initiative Group (DIG) was formed in the spring of 1999 “in response to several hate speech incidents on campus. Its aim was to increase communication among campus offices, student groups, and individuals; its initial membership consisted of more than 50 faculty and staff members, students, alumni, and trustees. The group also responded to potential crises and looked for ways to improve discussion of diversity issues. During his first year as president, Robert Oden took over the leadership of DIG, reorganizing it as a smaller group of about 15 on-campus members and making it a subcommittee of the College Council. Known as the New DIG, the group convene[d] routinely and focused its attention in several areas: a comprehensive review of the campus climate for all students; working to increase the representation of underrepresented groups on campus; and recommending that the College devote a substantial part of its programs during the 2005-06 academic year to issues of difference” (from “Multiculturalism at Carleton”, a booklet commissioned by Admissions around 2005). In January 2009, after the 2008 Campus Climate Survey, the New DIG transitioned to become the Community, Equity, and Diversity Initiative (CEDI) and continued as a committee of College Council. Since then, it has been co-chaired by a faculty and staff member in alternating two year positions and is run by a Leadership Board with Task Forces (later called Action Teams) around specific issues. It reports to the President and College Council.

CEDI’s mission “is to improve campus community and promote equity and diversity on campus. This happens by assessing campus climate needs and ideas, providing feedback on diversity initiatives, collaborating with other groups and supporting work already happening across multiple divisions, and initiating new projects to address the priorities and needs of the campus” (CEDI website, 2016).

The CEDI Structure and Functionality Action Team’s process

In the fall of 2015, CEDI co-chairs Adriana Estill and Mary Amy created an Action Team to look at CEDI’s Structure and Functionality, comprised of Carolyn Fure-Slocum (chair) and former CEDI co-chairs Mikki Showers and Matt Rand. The Action Team talked with over 30 faculty, staff, and students individually and in small groups regarding their thoughts on CEDI’s current structure and the types of changes that might improve CEDI’s effectiveness and visibility. The Action Team also examined the websites of many other colleges, plus had phone conversations or email exchanges with people at Beloit, Colorado College, Grinnell, Luther, Macalester, Williams, and Vassar to further assess their approaches in structuring diversity, inclusion, and identity committees or staffing.

Concerns raised about CEDI’s current structure in our listening process

Overall, the concerns raised on campus were fairly consistent. A majority of people we spoke with felt that:

- The CEDI membership has lacked continuity from year to year, requiring time to understand community needs before progress could be made or previous work continued;
- CEDI's current mission statement does not give enough direction and falls short of outlining clear responsibilities for the committee;
- Some committee members have lacked sufficient knowledge of diversity issues and so time was needed for them to "get their feet on the ground";
- CEDI's purpose hasn't been clear for some members of the committee itself or the larger campus;
- Though positioned to enhance communication across concerned groups/offices/departments, the information flow has not been strong;
- Communication with the larger campus about CEDI's role, responsibilities, and work has not been consistent;
- Continuous leadership is needed from all levels of the college to promote an ongoing focus on the vision for an inclusive residential liberal arts college.

On the positive side, many people noted:

- The large number of people engaged in various diversity issues across campus;
- The flexibility afforded by the formation of temporary and directed "action teams";
- The broad focus on many types of identity and diversity is a critical part of Carleton's approach;
- CEDI should continue to be focused on proactive and educational efforts, but also be a place for concerns to be raised.

Recommendations on Function:

CEDI should have two roles which at times may require delicate and complex navigation:

1) CEDI should play the role of the conscience of the College, raising issues that are not attended to elsewhere on campus. This may include responding to student, faculty, or staff concerns. CEDI should help to determine whether and when to do campus climate surveys, as part of assessing the state of inclusion and diversity at Carleton. The campus should also be regularly invited to contact CEDI committee members with concerns.

2) In concert with the College's goals for inclusion and diversity, CEDI's role should be proactive, educative, communicative, and coordinating. This includes:

CEDI should help to oversee, but not normally be in charge of, diversity conversations and education for students, faculty, and staff. This should include helping to make sure that dialogue, such as "Critical Conversations" (intergroup dialogue) for students and now faculty and staff, continues in some form; that Peer Leader, NSW, and on-going student trainings continue meaningfully; and helping to promote strong related programs in the Learning and Teaching Center, New Faculty Training, Faculty Retreats, Staff Development, and other faculty and staff dialogues on these issues. It may also include creating or promoting inter-identity convocations or panels. We recognize that many of these areas have a long history of being successfully directed by a large number of dedicated and engaged people on campus. We do not suggest that CEDI should take over their work, but we would like to see better communication among these different areas and offices to ensure that efforts are not being duplicated.

Recommendations on Structure:

In order to concentrate on changing community needs, CEDI should be charged annually with pertinent tasks by the President (in consultation with the Tuesday Group and College Council). This annual charge will help to give CEDI leadership more clarity and flexibility.

A report from CEDI should be sent to the President and College Council at the end of the year and put on CEDI's website, again for the sake of clarity and transparency.

The President should ask each division of the college to report back about their work related to campus climate, diversity, and identity. This information should then be shared by the president with CEDI leadership and the Tuesday Group to shape the charge for the coming year.

CEDI needs an upper administrative coordinator/advisor.

A person with direct links to the senior administration should help to coordinate CEDI activities. Ideally, this role would *not* be a rotating position for the sake of continuity. Under Carleton's current leadership structure this coordinator/advisor would be in either the President's Office or Dean of the College's Office and should be established or appointed at one of three administrative levels: Vice President/Chief Diversity and Inclusivity Office; Associate VP and Chief of Staff; Associate Dean of the College. This recommendation looks like a category of appointment commonly recognized by many universities, colleges, and corporations: that of the Chief Diversity and Inclusivity Officer (CDIO), charged with establishing long-term strategies to initiate and advance Carleton's status as a nationally recognized diverse and inclusive campus. Though some people believe that the hiring of a CDIO removes the responsibility of access, inclusion, and diversity concerns from other campus leaders, this need not be the case at Carleton. The CDIO would establish long-term goals with a well-articulated vision, ensure campus-wide communication coordinating the efforts and responsibility of all community members from all corners of campus. From student admissions and faculty hiring, to campus climate and visiting speakers, this important work must be given the administrative authority to bring together faculty, staff, and students to make significant progress toward an inclusive and diverse campus.

A different recommendation would be for a CEDI Coordinator/Advisor appointed at the level of Associate Vice President and Chief of Staff. Having a Coordinator/Advisor with direct links to the Tuesday Group will help to elevate the important role of CEDI, establish better visibility, and demonstrate the high priority of inclusion and diversity to the campus community. The CEDI Coordinator/Advisor role could also be filled by an Associate Dean of the College. The coordinator could be a part of an existing Associate Dean's responsibilities or a new Associate Dean position. The position could be linked to helping to recruit and retain diverse faculty members, encouraging conversation about handling difficult issues in the classroom, and possibly overseeing the Posse program—but this would be as part of their DOC role, not directly tied to CEDI.

CEDI should continue to be co-chaired by a faculty and staff member in two-year rotating terms. Each co-chair should be on the leadership team of CEDI for at least one year as a chair-elect before they become co-chair. This three-year commitment will help with the continuity problem and assist in getting them

“up-to-speed” before stepping into the co-chair role. The faculty and staff co-chairs will continue to be appointed to the chair-elect position by the Tuesday Group.

Two faculty members, one bi-weekly and one exempt staff member, and two students should be elected as at-large CEDI leadership team members by the faculty, SAC, Forum, and CSA, respectively. Making these elected positions will help raise the status of these positions and keep people from being taken off CEDI to fulfill other positions.

The CEDI leadership team should meet bi-weekly. The leadership team should consist of the six elected at-large members, the Coordinator/Advisor of CEDI, the co-chairs (present and future), and ex-officio members from the potential Bias Incident Response Team (DOS staff), the Director of Faculty Diversity Recruitment, OIIL, GSC, TRIO/SSS, the Chaplain’s Office, Disability Services, and Title IX.

As is now the case, “Action Teams” may be formed around particular concerns and/or recommendations. The Action Teams will report back to the leadership team frequently. In order to enhance that communication, the Action Teams may include or be led by members of the CEDI leadership team, including the ex-officio members, but excluding the co-chairs. The Action Teams should be evaluated each year to determine whether they should continue or whether different Action Teams should be created.

A larger CEDI-related group should meet as needed, and at least at the beginning and end of each year, to help communicate with the campus about inclusion and diversity concerns and to enhance communication between the many individuals, groups, committees, or offices working on related issues. For instance, CEDI may invite particular groups to attend a regular CEDI meeting, hold a campus-wide open forum, or invite a larger group into regular dialogue. At these broader CEDI meetings, the leadership team and/or related offices could report on what they are doing, with discussions about particular topics or concerns. The larger group may include the leadership team above, plus representatives of different student groups as is relevant at that time, other faculty (such as the Posse mentors and others teaching in these areas), class deans, the ombudsperson/Equal Opportunity coordinator, and Action Team representatives.

This structure of a CEDI Leadership Team, with Action Teams as needed, and the ability to call larger meetings permits quick action on pressing issues, while at the same time promoting communication among the many groups, individuals, offices, and departments involved in diversity and identity issues. A continuing open question is whether CEDI should remain a committee of College Council and if so, why?

Resources Needed:

The CEDI website should be enhanced and updated frequently in order to communicate better with the campus. This would include posting the annual charge to CEDI, annual reports and meeting minutes, CEDI's current members and their contact information, as well as notices of current work or events.

Assistance from the Web staff may be required to improve visibility.

CEDI needs a budget of \$10,000 in order to fund conference participation, trainings, projects, lecturers, facilitate campus conversation, etc. For larger projects or events, CEDI leadership should speak to the President or other relevant offices (e.g., the Convocation Committee).

Administrative support (a 10-hour-week student employee) is necessary and should report directly to both the coordinator/advisor and the co-chairs.

Name Change:

We encourage discussion of whether to change CEDI's name. Some feel that a name change clearly indicates a "reboot" and that some of the words in "Community, Equity, and Diversity Initiative" are not as relevant now. Others feel that the "CEDI" name is known, at least among faculty and staff, and that "rebranding" it would take time. One suggestion is to keep the same acronym but to have it stand for "Community, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion". Other ideas include: the "Carleton Committee for Inclusion and Diversity" (CCID), the "Committee for a Just Community" (CJC), and the "Committee for an Equitable and Just Community" (CEJC).

Appendix

Job Description for CEDI Co-Chairs

We recommend that CEDI continue to have **two co-chairs: one staff (bi-weekly or exempt staff) and one tenured faculty member**. Neither will serve as task force leaders or members; their role will be primarily to coordinate, communicate and administrate.

The tenured faculty co-chair will have a course release. The staff co-chair will be given the flexibility and support to make some adjustments in their responsibilities to create time for CEDI.

The responsibilities of the co-chairs include working collaboratively and in equal partnership to:

- Help CEDI develop and communicate an evolving vision of diversity and inclusion at Carleton
- Encourage and help to weave together various campus initiatives on diversity
- Prepare the agenda and lead the bi-weekly CEDI Leadership Board meetings
- Work with Action Team coordinators to monitor progress towards goals
- Plan the bi-annual larger CEDI meetings and other expanded CEDI meetings as needed
- Regularly communicate with campus constituencies about CEDI's work
- Disseminate information to the entire campus community, and act as contact people for questions
- Suggest possible nominees to CEDI
- Keep up-to-date on developments in the areas of diversity, equity, and inclusion in higher education
- Work closely with the CEDI Coordinator/Advisor and report regularly to the President and Tuesday Group

Job Description for the Coordinator/Advisor of CEDI

The CEDI Coordinator/Advisor will:

- Work with the co-chairs to help CEDI develop and communicate an evolving vision of diversity and inclusion at Carleton
- Help the co-chairs encourage and weave together various campus initiatives on diversity
- Counsel the co-chairs on the collaborative nature of their partnership in this work
- Serve as a liaison between the President's Office, Tuesday Group, and the co-chairs
- Advise the co-chairs as needed on CEDI's work and plans
- Be the keeper of historical memory on previous decisions and projects
- Help as needed and possible with projects or events
- Facilitate administrative support in the President's Office for CEDI.
- Work with the supervisors of the staff co-chairs to ensure support for the full participation of the staff member

Appendix Three: New CEDI structure - voted in by College Council

The Community, Equity, and Diversity Initiative (CEDI) Structure and Function May, 2016 (revised 5-24-16)

Tuesday Group discussed the April 2016 recommendations of the CEDI Structure and Functionality Action Team with CEDI co-chair Adriana Estill. (Staff co-chair Mary Amy was on medical leave but expressed her support for the Action Team's proposal.) Following this discussion, Tuesday Group endorsed the Action Team's recommendations and has come to the following decisions regarding the future structure/function of CEDI.

CEDI's Roles:

- 1) CEDI plays a special listening and hortatory role (part of the "conscience" of the College), being attentive to community concerns and raising issues that are not attended to elsewhere on campus. This may include giving voice to student, faculty, or staff concerns. CEDI should help to determine whether and when to do campus climate surveys as part of assessing the state of inclusion and diversity at Carleton. The campus should also be regularly invited to contact CEDI committee members with concerns.
- 2) In concert with the College's goals for inclusion and diversity, CEDI's role should be proactive, educative, communicative, and coordinating.

Annual Charge:

CEDI will be charged annually by the President (in consultation with the Tuesday Group and College Council) to attend to issues of particular import to the community. These issues may be drawn from work related to campus climate, diversity, and identity that is happening across the College. This annual charge will help to give CEDI leadership clarity and flexibility.

A report from CEDI should be sent to the President and College Council at the end of the year and posted on CEDI's website for the sake of clarity and transparency.

Advisor:

For the sake of continuity and connection, A CEDI Advisor will be appointed at the level of Associate Vice President and Chief of Staff to help provide links to the Tuesday Group and augment the visibility for CEDI, demonstrating the high priority of inclusion and diversity to the campus community. The CEDI Advisor will:

- Work with the co-chairs to help CEDI develop and communicate an evolving vision of diversity and inclusion at Carleton
- Help the co-chairs encourage and weave together various campus initiatives on diversity
- Counsel the co-chairs on the collaborative nature of their partnership in this work
- Serve as a liaison between the President's Office, Tuesday Group, and the co-chairs
- Advise the co-chairs as needed on CEDI's work and plans
- Be the keeper of historical memory on previous decisions and projects
- Help as needed and possible with projects or events
- Facilitate administrative support in the President's Office for CEDI.
- Work with the supervisors of staff co-chairs to ensure support for the full participation of the staff member

CEDI Co-Chairs:

CEDI will be co-chaired by a faculty and staff member in two-year, staggered terms. Each of these co-chairs will serve one year as a future chair-designate on CEDI, prior to their two-year leadership roles (a time during which orientation, conferences, and training can occur to prepare them for leadership of the group). The faculty and staff co-chairs, as well as the future chair-designates will be appointed to their respective positions by the Tuesday Group, in consultation with the FAC (faculty) and SAC/Forum (staff).

The tenured faculty co-chair will have a course release. The staff co-chair will receive a stipend and will be given the flexibility and support to make some adjustments in their responsibilities to create time for CEDI. Neither will serve as CEDI Action Team leaders or members; their role will be primarily to coordinate, communicate, and lead CEDI's efforts.

The responsibilities of the co-chairs include working collaboratively and in equal partnership to:

- Help CEDI develop and communicate an evolving vision of diversity and inclusion at Carleton
- Encourage and help to weave together various campus initiatives on diversity
- Prepare the agenda and lead the bi-weekly CEDI leadership board meetings
- Work with Action Team coordinators to monitor progress towards goals
- Plan the bi-annual larger CEDI meetings and other expanded CEDI meetings as needed
- Regularly communicate with campus constituencies about CEDI's work
- Disseminate information to the entire campus community, and act as contact people for questions
- Keep up-to-date on developments in the areas of diversity, equity, and inclusion in higher education
- Suggest possible leadership nominees to CEDI
- Work closely with the CEDI Advisor and report regularly to the President and Tuesday Group.

Membership/Meetings:

Two faculty members, one bi-weekly staff member, one exempt staff member, and two students will be selected as at-large CEDI leadership board members by the faculty, SAC, Forum, and CSA, respectively. The faculty at-large members will be selected by the FAC.

The CEDI leadership board will meet bi-weekly. The leadership board will consist of the six elected at-large members, the Advisor of CEDI, the co-chairs (present and future), and *ex officio* members from the Dean of Students office (e.g., the Coordinator of a potential Bias Incident Response Team), the Director of Faculty Diversity Recruitment, OIIL, GSC, TRIO/SSS, the Chaplain's Office, Disability Services, and the Title IX Coordinator.

As is now the case, "Action Teams" may be formed around particular concerns and/or recommendations. The Action Teams will be evaluated each year to determine whether they should continue or whether different Action Teams should be created.

A larger CEDI-related group will meet as needed, and at least at the beginning and end of each year, to help communicate with the campus about inclusion and diversity concerns and to enhance communication between the many individuals, groups, committees, or offices working on related issues.

CEDI will report to College Council.

Resources Needed:

The CEDI website will be the focus of enhanced and updated information in order to communicate more effectively with the campus.

CEDI may draw upon its current budget (\$2,800 in FY16) to fund conference participation, trainings, projects, lecturers, facilitate campus conversation, etc. For larger one-time projects or events, CEDI leadership should speak to the President or other relevant offices (e.g., the Convocation Committee). Additional base budget requests, substantiated by the specifics of the initiatives being considered, will be considered by Tuesday Group.

Administrative support (in the form of a student employee) will report directly to the Advisor, with regular check-ins with the co-chairs.

Assessment:

This structure and its substantive results will be re-assessed by Tuesday Group at the end of the 2017-18 academic year to determine whether it is meeting the needs of the community.

Appendix Four: Report from the Faculty Diversity Training Action Team

(Delivered May 15 2016)

WHAT TOPICS SHOULD BE EXPLORED AT THE FALL FACULTY RETREAT

- Best practices for pronouns/forms of address, particularly in early-college contexts (like A&I seminars)
- Being as clear as possible about expectations around writing and class participation, while keeping in mind students are coming from high school with very different expectations around writing and class participation

How do we build relationships with students so they can come to us and talk to us when problems arise?

How do faculty help students understand how assessment works in their class/department/College? What does a grade mean? How are we communicating our criteria for evaluating student work? How are we keeping in mind different contexts students are coming from in terms of expectations about writing?

How do we build classroom discussion guidelines or establish norms that allow us to bring in student experiences and identities without making students spokespeople for those experiences and identities? Relatedly, how do we support ALL of our students in being able to engage productively in discussions? How do we pay attention to student silences?

How do faculty intervene/manage student to student exchanges in class? How do we balance supporting students' skill development in being able to challenge each other and when do we jump in?

How do faculty ensure that group work is effective and inclusive? When do we intervene, especially if there are study groups outside of class? [STEM faculty]

Not for faculty retreat but something that came up repeatedly: making clear community norms and "unwritten rules" in A & Is/Intros.

IDEAS FOR HOW THESE TOPICS SHOULD BE EXPLORED

Possibly have 2 to 3 students present for 10 minutes about WHY this work is important.

A couple initial thoughts about this: pre-retreat homework is probably a bad idea. So a presentation of findings/overview to the gathered crowd might be good place to start. [PH] I think presenting the findings

is fine, but I also think there needs to be a concise argument made by someone [Bev, Jeff, Steve, etc.] about WHY we should all be interested in the findings. (Anita) Agreed. [PH]

Other ideas

A theme throughout is that of communicative gaps. For example: “It is hard for students to call out faculty members when identity issues come up in problematic ways because of the grading authority faculty have over students.” This of course leads more or less directly to things like this: “Faculty members have no idea what students are experiencing on campus.” So it’s a vicious circle. Ways and means of communicating, both good and bad, seem to underpin much of what’s in Andrea’s document.

Related to communication, how do we reassure our students that we have the same standards for their writing, for example? There’s a point made by an international student about grammar and I mark down all students for their grammatical mistakes and all students make grammatical mistakes, not just students whose first language isn’t English. [Anita]

Another theme that seems important is how to balance making room for students to share their experiences without assuming their experiences based on their identities or making them spokespeople for their identity groups. [Anita] To add to Anita’s point, how do we address students who volunteer as the spokesperson of a chosen identity? Oftentimes there are students that share dissimilar sentiments and/or beliefs in the classroom, but may be too shy to enter the discussion. [Steph]

How do faculty ensure that group work is effective and inclusive? [Anita]

Building relationships with students--office hours, meetings, etc. [Anita]

“Faculty members reaching out is POWERFUL.” Whether this be academic, emotional, or moral support, in my experience, most students react very positively to this. With that being said, Carleton (and other liberal arts institutions) do a lot of handholding and spoonfeeding, which sometimes leads to overblown expectations of said faculty. I believe some students deify certain faculty members and vilify others (this is due mostly to grading, inaccessibility of office hours, or email response time). I think it will benefit students if faculty humanize themselves (see: you all have a life outside of Carleton), and reiterate that ultimately, learning requires effort from the students. [Steph]

Mitigating classroom tensions: Hypocrisy, conservative and religious viewpoints on campus and appropriate engagement with sensitive course material.

As a student, I've heard anecdotes where didactic discussions on problematic topics were received very poorly by the class. I wonder, what are some ways to re-institute a safe arena for opinions to be challenged? After all, don't we all desire the expository and oratory skills to assert ourselves with conviction and be certain our argument has withstood the most robust of evaluations? I worry if this aspect of dialogue is thrown to the wayside.

“It is very helpful for faculty members to model ways of appropriately engaging in the critique of works coming from authors who differ from the reader based on race or other characteristics. How can students engage in critique without delegitimizing the author or writing? How can one do this respectfully and without adopting an academic lens in a problematic way?” Agreed. [Steph]

Bridging the gap between academic and every-day rhetoric: this one is more general. I believe students of all creeds would feel more comfortable on campus if there developed a more cogent community around fair and open dialogue. How can faculty help students learn to argue logically, without resorting to fallacious rhetoric, name-calling, and personal attacks? [Steph] Additionally, how can faculty help students learn to articulate their views in the classroom in order to separate the way issues are discussed on campus versus in the classroom? [Margot]

IDEAS FOR HOW THESE TOPICS SHOULD BE EXPLORED

Possibly have 2 to 3 students present for 10 minutes about WHY this work is important.

A couple initial thoughts about this: pre-retreat homework is probably a bad idea. So a presentation of findings/overview to the gathered crowd might be a good place to start. [PH] I think presenting the findings is fine, but I also think there needs to be a concise argument made by someone [Bev, Jeff, Steve, etc.] about WHY we should all be interested in the findings. (Anita) Agreed. [PH]

Faculty issue BUT not necessarily for retreat--ensuring that A & Is and Intro courses do some of the “work” that might be necessary to ensure that all students learn more about how to be successful at Carleton.

Appendix Four: Report from the Carleton Culture Action Team

(Delivered 6/15/2016)

CEDI Action Team: Carleton Culture
Notes from final 2015-2016 meeting 5/25/2016
(Notes 6/14/2016; lj)

Present: Serena Chalaka , Aaron Chaput, , Laska Jimsen, Joy Klutz, Sara Nielsen, David Wiles
Members of the Committee not present: Leanne Ellison, Anne Hamilton

Recommendations for the Diversity Statement

LOCATION ON SITE/ADDITIONS

- Statement should be easier to access from core landing pages (rather than needing to search for it)
- There needs to be a central location for the statement as well as resources on campus and beyond (resources about MN and Northfield specifically; we are not isolated or “in a bubble”)
- These pages are a start, but could be significantly more comprehensive:
 - <https://apps.carleton.edu/about/diversity/>
 - <https://apps.carleton.edu/admissions/topics/diversity/>
- A diversity timeline with goals, progress, and priorities would be an excellent addition
- In addition to the statement there should be a letter from the president and/or the Board of Trustees that shows leadership from the top (we saw this at many peer institutions)

LANGUAGE

- The statement should be *actionable* with specific action items on how to accomplish goals
- Consider adding “Inclusion,” “Social Justice,” and/or “Equity” to title of statement
- Generally we found the statement portrays Carleton as an *institution* with a *task* in regards to diversity. We recommend that the statement portray Carleton as a *community of individuals* who are *responsible* and *accountable*.
- We would like the statement to reflect that we are a community learning about one another; no one has the burden to teach others
- We find the second bullet point, “Carleton students must meaningfully encounter difference in order to grow personally and live fruitfully in society and contribute to its work,” problematic in that it suggests that students of color/underrepresented groups are on campus so that white students might benefit from them.
- We don’t like the word *equip* in the first line of the statement.
- *Cultivate* and *celebrate* are words committee members recommend.
- The statement could also reflect the value of a Carleton education – who do we want to send out into the world as alums?

Other Website Recommendations

ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS

(Recommendations from Anne Hamilton)

- more pictures and more recent students/faculty/staff/events/etc
- state ideas more succinctly, maybe using bullet points would be a good idea
- emphasize that all opportunities are available to everyone (ex. student art fee financial aid help, women in the physics/heavy science majors,
- acknowledge that some majors have certain reps of types of people that study in that department to be upfront about it and state facts to support if it is or is not accurate particularly so prospective students and prospective majors can get a real idea of what they are considering getting into
- make a flowchart or timeline showing the typical path of a major (a couple sites had this but not most) or which classes are typically available during which terms so that it is less intimidating to try to work through how to major in that department

CAMPUS LIFE

(Recommendations from Sara Nielsen)

Cons

- Student's quotes (Students Say) are outdated (The 8 quotes are from the classes of 2013-15)
- Campus Photos Home page – Sports – 16 athlete photos are all from 2011-13 NO PEOPLE OF COLOR
- Campus Photos – Student Activities, Nice variety of photos (58 total) but most are REALLY old- 2002-2007
- Campus Photos Home page, Northfield, outdated
- Campus Photos Home page, The Arb, outdated photos
- Some of the student organizations info is outdated, but this info is probably maintained by the students

Pros

- “What’s Happening” on the homepage is good.
- Campus Photos Homepage--Campus Scenery, Buildings
- Campus Photos Homepage, Residence Halls and Houses - good
- Campus Photos Homepage –“ Capture Your Photo” form to submit photos