



Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion

***Strategic Implementation Plan
for the Recommendations of the
SCU Blue Ribbon Commission on
Diversity and Inclusion***

June 29, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Leadership..... | 7 |
| Strategic Planning and (Re)Structuring..... | 12 |
| Accountability and Future Implementation | 20 |
| Student Recruitment and Admissions | 22 |
| Campus Support Systems and Learning Opportunities | 31 |
| Faculty Recruitment and Hiring | 40 |
| Faculty and Staff Training and Development | 47 |
| Use of Data and Evidence | 51 |
| Conclusion..... | 54 |
| Appendix – Table of Recommendations, Initiatives and Programs..... | 55 |

INTRODUCTION

In April 2016, Fr. Michael Engh, President of Santa Clara University (SCU), established a Blue Ribbon Commission on Diversity and Inclusion, which was charged with creating an aspirational vision to advance diversity and inclusion at SCU. The Commission's twelve members, support staff, and consultants from the Culturally Engaging Campus Environments (CECE) project together produced a [report](#), which was presented to Fr. Engh on December 9, 2016. The report included a list of 37 recommendations, grouped into seven topic areas.

On March 8, 2017, Fr. Engh shared the findings and recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Commission (BRC) with the University community. Around the same time, he asked SCU's University Coordinating Committee to form a Task Force, with consultation from the Planning Action Council, with the following goal: ***Building on the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Commission, draft a strategic plan to promote diversity and inclusion at Santa Clara University.***

Charge

The formal charge of the Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion is to:

Review the Blue Ribbon Commission report and develop a strategic plan for diversity and inclusion. Prioritize the 37 CECE recommendations from the Blue Ribbon Commission report with attention to their feasibility, time of implementation, estimated cost, and likely impact on the proposed strategic plan. Fashion the strategic plan around concrete goals that can be advanced through specific initiatives and programs with measurable outcomes in the next five years (understanding that many worthy goals may take decades to be fully realized). In developing and refining the Task Force's report, the Task Force should consult with units and members of the University community who have relevant perspective, experience, and expertise.

Members

As recommended by the University Coordinating Committee (UCC), the membership of the Task Force was composed of three faculty members, three members of the staff or administration, and two undergraduate students, along with a staff member to provide administrative support. The group's members were:

- Elsa Chen (Task Force Chair), Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
- Linda Garber, Chair, Department of Women's and Gender Studies
- Anna Sampaio, Chair, Department of Ethnic Studies

- Hsin-I Cheng, Associate Professor, Department of Communication¹
- Lester Deanes, Assistant Dean for Student Life
- Denise Castillo Chavez, Assistant Director, Undergraduate Admission
- Jahwala Johns, class of 2019; member of ASG leadership
- Zipporah Ridley, class of 2017; member of Unity 4; Chair, Student Council on Inclusive Excellence
- Ray Plaza (Staff Support), Director of the Office of Diversity and Inclusion

Process

The Task Force met on the following dates:

| | |
|----------------|---------------|
| March 17, 2017 | May 19, 2017 |
| April 4, 2017 | May 26, 2017 |
| April 13, 2017 | June 2, 2017 |
| April 28, 2017 | June 9, 2017 |
| May 5, 2017 | June 23, 2017 |
| May 12, 2017 | |

After the initial two meetings, the group spent the next six sessions discussing clusters of recommendations from the Blue Ribbon Commission. Most of these meetings included a presentation to update the Task Force on consultations and a review of feedback from key stakeholders at SCU. The Task Force members ranked each of the numbered recommendations in the cluster by priority and difficulty, while engaging in discussion of specific recommendations. After each of the clusters had been discussed, the Task Force followed up on several topics. In the last few weeks, the Task Force focused on review, discussion, and revision of drafts of the final report.

Consultations

Outside of meeting times, each Task Force member completed a spreadsheet rating each of the 37 recommendations along three dimensions: importance, timeline for implementation, and level of difficulty. Members also recommended individuals to consult for each of the recommendations, and offered their own knowledge and comments about selected BRC recommendations.

Also outside of meeting times, the Task Force chair (Elsa Chen) and support staff (Ray Plaza) reached out to stakeholders throughout the university for consultations. Each consultation

¹ Due to an unanticipated situation that required her to take medical leave, Dr. Cheng was unable to continue serving on the Task Force after the second meeting. She did provide written feedback before her departure.

request asked for input on a specific BRC recommendation or group of recommendations. Consultants were asked to respond to five questions for each of the recommendations in the group:

- 1) What is currently happening?
- 2) What should/can be done immediately? What would be the time frame for making progress on the other items?
- 3) Who should do it?
- 4) What needs to change (how) to make progress on these?
- 5) What would be an appropriate plan for ensuring progress and accountability on these recommendations?

Several of the individuals and groups contacted for consultations requested in-person meetings, which were arranged with Elsa Chen and/or Ray Plaza. In-person conversations were held with several groups, including:

- President's Cabinet, including President; Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; Vice President for University Relations; Vice President for Enrollment Management; Interim Vice President for Finance and Administration; General Counsel; Chief of Staff; Athletics Director; and Director of the Ignatian Center for Jesuit Education
- Deans of the College of Arts & Sciences, Education and Counseling Psychology, Business, Engineering, Law, and Jesuit School of Theology
- Vice Provost for Student Life; Vice Provost for Academic Affairs; Vice Provost for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness; and Vice Provost for Information Technology
- Associate Provost for Research and Faculty Affairs; Associate Provost for Global Engagement; Interim Associate Provost for Diversity and Inclusion; Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies; Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Development; Director of the de Saisset Museum
- Undergraduate Admission and Financial Aid leadership and staff
- Human Resources leadership and staff
- University Marketing and Communications leadership and staff
- Alumni Association leadership and staff
- Representatives of the Office of the President
- Faculty members

Written consultations were provided by:

- Director of the LEAD Program
- Office of Assessment
- Human Resources
- Institutional Research
- Office for Multicultural Learning
- Drahmman Advising Center
- Career Services

Finally, additional feedback was shared with the Task Force by other members of the University community (including individual and collective groups of students, staff, and faculty) and taken into consideration in the consultation process. Engagement with students occurred through the student representatives on the Task Force in our meetings and in individual conversations. A student focus group was scheduled and held, but did not garner a lot of attendance.

Context

Efforts to increase racial and ethnic diversity, and to promote an increasingly inclusive campus climate at SCU, are integral to our mission as a Jesuit institution of higher education with a genuine commitment to social justice among communities who are poor, oppressed, and marginalized. As elucidated by the Society of Jesus in the United States:

Catholic social justice centers on the establishment of the kingdom of God within the hearts of men and women and then within their societies. Solidarity with the rest of the human race means the practical awareness that only by working together can the human family meet effectively the challenges of worldwide hunger, ignorance, disease, and violence. *But solidarity also means extending of care to those close at hand who have been ignored or abandoned within our society. Solidarity also means a commitment to change the economic, political, and social structures that enslave, dehumanize, and destroy human life and dignity. Each Jesuit university must examine its own social environment, including its own commitment to justice and solidarity* (emphasis added).²

By making a commitment to carry out these recommendations, SCU has an opportunity to be a leader among Jesuit higher education institutions nationwide in the pursuit of social justice by making real and continuing progress on racial and ethnic justice for those who already are, or who seek to become, members of our Santa Clara community. Not only is this work closely aligned with SCU's Jesuit, Catholic values, but it is also strategically important as the demographic makeup of our current and future student population grows increasingly diverse.

In light of the "Sustaining Excellence" initiative that took place at SCU throughout the 2016-17 academic year, the Task Force strongly cautions SCU's leadership against viewing the promotion of fiscal responsibility and efforts to increase racial and ethnic diversity and inclusion as competing goals. It is critical that efforts to sustain excellence prioritize substantial investments to advance SCU's most important strategic priorities and values. [Goal 5 of the Santa Clara 2020 Integrated Strategic Plan](#) states: "Santa Clara University will recruit and graduate a broadly diverse community of highly talented students while striving to make a Santa Clara education more affordable." The following objectives are clearly articulated in the Strategic Plan:

- Increase the enrollment, retention, and graduation rates of students from

² Society of Jesus in the United States, "Communal Reflection on the Jesuit Mission in Higher Education: A Way of Proceeding," in George W. Traub, SJ. *A Jesuit Education Reader* (Chicago: Loyola Press), p. 185.

- underrepresented or underserved populations
- Provide sufficient financial assistance to ensure that low-income students and students from middle-class families can afford the costs of a holistic Santa Clara University education
- Efficiently deploy resources to effectively execute Santa Clara's programs and operations while minimizing future tuition increases
- Recruit and retain outstanding faculty members whose teaching, research, and life experience enrich the diversity of Santa Clara's academic community with respect to race, ethnicity, and gender.

These goals cannot be accomplished without a significant outlay of resources. Failure to devote the requisite resources to the recommendations outlined in the Blue Ribbon Commission's report as well as the specific strategies in this report will compromise SCU's competitiveness and relevance as the population of college-eligible students becomes increasingly diverse, as SCU graduates move increasingly into employment and educational opportunities where they must engage respectfully and competently with a diverse clientele, and as employers seek broader racial and ethnic representation among new hires. Therefore, advancement of the objectives outlined above and throughout this report must be a priority for ongoing and future phases of the capital campaign and other fundraising efforts.

Limitations

The members of the Task Force would like to emphasize that while substantial effort went into the creation of this report, time and resource constraints limited the extent to which the group was able to carry out every aspect of its broad and ambitious charge. For example, it is premature to make cost estimates for most of the recommendations until a full assessment of resources, needs, and gaps is completed. The strategies we outline here (particularly with regard to BRC recommendations #9, #11, and #38) establish mechanisms through which future budget estimates and discussions should take place.

While extensive consultations were conducted in the course of this Task Force's work on this report, further consultations, solicitation of feedback and ideas, collection of data, and development of detailed plans are required as the process of implementation of the Blue Ribbon Commission's recommendations moves forward. In particular, given the timing of the Task Force meetings, it was challenging to engage faculty and students whose work centers on diversity in meaningful consultation. Such engagement and investment will be vital to successful implementation of the report recommendations. The report includes recommendations on how to proceed with additional information-gathering and planning.

In addition, a comprehensive review of the existing efforts to engage racial and ethnic diversity at SCU, as well as the long history of the previous commissions, reports, committees, and other diversity initiatives and the various historic and enduring struggles and tensions related to race and ethnicity are beyond the scope of this report. While the report highlights examples of existing efforts that are relevant to specific recommendations, these examples represent only a

small sample of the work that is being done throughout our community. Many other examples were shared with us during the consultation process but are not discussed here.³ The Task Force made a conscious decision to focus primarily on forward-looking strategies for implementation.

Diversity and inclusion work is both critically important and inherently complex, challenging, and difficult. While the members of the Task Force agreed on most of the ideas and language included in this report, we were not always able to reach a consensus about specific ideas and strategies. Therefore, on a very small number of topics, we collectively decided to “agree to disagree” and to explain the basis of our disagreement in this report.

Structure of This Report

In the sections that follow, we address each of the Blue Ribbon Commission’s 37 recommendations, in seven sections corresponding to areas identified by the Blue Ribbon Commission:

- A. Leadership
- B. Strategic planning and (re)structuring
- C. Student recruitment and admissions
- D. Campus support systems and learning opportunities
- E. Faculty recruitment and hiring
- F. Faculty and staff training and development
- G. Use of data and evidence

In addition to the 37 recommendations, we include a 38th recommendation, on Accountability and Future Implementation. This has been added after section (B).

In each section, we prioritize the recommendations within each area by importance (however, the order of the sections themselves follows the BRC report and does *not* indicate an order of priority). Our discussion of each recommendation includes a few selected examples of work that is already being done in each area, as well as implementation strategies regarding next

³ We also want to acknowledge that prior reports have examined diversity efforts at Santa Clara University. For example, in 1991, Father Locatelli, SCU’s President at the time, convened a Task Force on Inclusive Excellence to study the state of campus diversity. SCU was also part of the Irvine Campus Diversity Initiative (CDI). The James Irvine Foundation established the Campus Diversity Initiative (CDI), a \$29 million effort, to assist twenty-eight independent colleges and universities in California with strategically improving campus diversity. The six-year initiative (2000-2005), which included SCU, supported a range of activities and institutional changes with the aim of increasing access and success of low-income and underrepresented minority students in higher education. A copy of the reports and studies is available at: <http://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/learning-through-evaluation-james-irvine-foundation-campus> and at <https://folio.iupui.edu/handle/10244/51>. In addition, Santa Clara University is accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The 2000 WASC Reaffirmation Report and the 2011 WASC SCU Educational Effectiveness Review both reference SCU’s efforts with diversity and inclusion. These reports are available at: <https://www.scu.edu/provost/institutional-effectiveness/recent-accreditation-reports/> (access to the reports requires an SCU login).

steps and longer-term steps that should be taken to advance the BRC recommendations. Each of our specific implementation strategies is highlighted in **boldface**.

LEADERSHIP

Under the area of Leadership, the Blue Ribbon Commission (BRC) issued the following recommendations:

- (1) Declare a visible commitment to diversity and inclusion
- (2) Communicate a clear vision for diversity and inclusion
- (3) Integrate diversity and inclusion into language and communications
- (4) Prioritize and maintain transparency about diversity and inclusion efforts
- (5) Set goals to increase representational diversity of leadership
- (6) Proactively support faculty and student leaders

HIGH PRIORITY AREAS

The recommendations viewed as high priority by the Task Force in the Leadership area include:

- (1) Declare a visible commitment to diversity and inclusion
- (2) Communicate a clear vision for diversity and inclusion
- (5) Set goals to increase representational diversity of leadership
- (6) Proactively support faculty and student leaders

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

The Task Force recognizes that in order to be effective in SCU's efforts to move forward on all of the recommendations in this report, we must first establish a common understanding of what is meant when we use the phrase "diversity and inclusion." In the context of this report and its recommendations, *"diversity and inclusion" work refers to efforts to remedy enduring forms of racism and racial and ethnic inequality that have negatively impacted the composition and climate of the university.* The recommendations herein and in the BRC report are intended to *advance greater representation and inclusion of historically marginalized racial and ethnic groups and to create a more equitable and just campus environment.* Because race and ethnicity intersect with, or exist in relationship to, other modes of subordination, the Task Force recommendations are intended to remedy these complex intersections of inequality. Ultimately, such an intersectional approach is vital to advancing equality for all people of color.

RECOMMENDATION #1: Visible Commitment

The BRC report reiterated the need for a visible and firm commitment to diversity and inclusion. The Task Force is in agreement with this recommendation, noting that some

examples of visible commitment are already present at SCU but more needs to be done.

This recommendation is related to BRC recommendations #2, #3 and #4. The Task Force notes that showing a “visible” commitment to diversity must translate into changes in policy, process, and climate as well as institutional form and practice for statements of support to have real impact and lasting meaning for our campus. Such a visible commitment must also change the composition of the campus and specifically create greater representation of historically marginalized racial and ethnic populations among students, staff, faculty, and administrators. The strategies outlined in our report are intended to create this kind of change, and moving forward with them will provide clear evidence of a visible commitment.

Examples of existing work related to this recommendation include the establishment of the Blue Ribbon Commission and subsequently the Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion; and the implementation of changes recommended by Unity 4 and continuing updates and engagement through quarterly town halls. Demonstrated support for undocumented students, including the formation of the Hurtado scholarship program and support for students on campus, and ongoing UndocuAlly trainings for faculty and staff, also serve as part of the university’s current visible commitment to diversity and inclusion.

RECOMMENDATION #2: Clear Vision

The BRC report stressed the importance of the communication and articulation of a clear vision for diversity and inclusion. The Task Force is in agreement with this recommendation and notes that this is related to BRC recommendations #1 (declaring a visible commitment), #3 (integrating it in language and communications), and #4 (maintaining transparency).

This recommendation provides an excellent opportunity to offer a clear and consistent definition of “diversity and inclusion” (as we have done above) and what it means in our current context, as well as an opportunity to articulate why diversity is good for the institution and how it relates to our Jesuit mission and values. This clear vision also needs to take into account what we as an institution mean by racial and ethnic justice and what it means to dismantle oppressive systems. Our collective work to advance diversity and inclusion, as defined above, is clearly tied to the Jesuit value of social justice, as articulated in the introduction to this report. **Communications about diversity and inclusion should emphasize the rationale and need for this work, its integral ties to our values as a Jesuit, Catholic institution, and the benefits that related efforts provide to our community as a whole.**

To provide “a clear vision,” we also need to address the confusion among many in the SCU community about the roles of various offices and departments which deal centrally and consistently with diversity work on campus, including the Office of Multicultural Learning, the Multicultural Center, the LEAD program, the Ethnic Studies Department, the Women’s and Gender Studies Department, and especially the Office for Diversity and Inclusion (ODI). This requires **clarifying the structures, units, and departments on campus who deal centrally and consistently with diversity and inclusion among students, faculty and staff**, as highlighted in

BRC recommendations #7-9.

We should better utilize the SCU website to integrate and synchronize the various diversity related web pages, including the “[Diversity](#)” page that is accessible directly from the “[About SCU](#)” landing page on the SCU website, to provide a clear conduit to the web sites of units on campus that work on diversity and inclusion issues. Rather than organizing web resources around offices, **the central “diversity” site should be organized to make it easier for users to find what they need based on issues, needs, groups, etc.**, without requiring an understanding of organizational charts and the like. Ideally, **information about efforts and events related to diversity and inclusion across campus should be shared and continuously updated on both the general “Diversity” page and the specific web pages associated with individual units and departments.** This will help to centralize and synchronize existing online resources without replacing, reducing, or eliminating any of the numerous existing websites. Work on this recommendation can be facilitated by Office for Diversity and Inclusion in cooperation with University Marketing and Communication in consultation and communication with the many offices and groups throughout our community who are engaged in diversity and inclusion work.

RECOMMENDATION #5: Diversity in Leadership

The BRC report urged the institution to set goals to increase the representational diversity of leadership. The Task Force wishes to specify that the phrase “increasing representational diversity,” as used here and in other parts of this report, refers to expanding the number of individuals from historically underrepresented racial and ethnic populations within our students, staff, faculty, and administration.

The Task Force acknowledges significant progress over the past seven years with regard to the representation of women among administrative leaders at SCU (i.e. as four of our six Deans), and the recent appointment of people of color to the positions of Dean and Vice Provost. We encourage the leadership to **proceed with intentionality with regard to racial and ethnic diversity as future searches are conducted and appointments are made.**

Inclusive search training is already in place for tenure-track faculty and staff hires, most of the faculty searches have a **diversity component in the rubric**, and most do include a **diversity-related question in the interview** process. **If any of these elements are not already present during all searches for executive level hires, they should be implemented immediately.**

Any discussion of leadership also requires a close look at the composition of the Board of Trustees, as well as an understanding of how the Board brings in new members. **The Board of Trustees should be encouraged by the University leadership to engage in discussions regarding how they can increase their efforts to diversify their new membership.** ODI, Faculty Development, and other key diversity stakeholders such as the Ethnic Studies and Women’s and Gender Studies Department as well as other offices can support these efforts.

Currently, the institution is required to submit a formal Affirmative Action Plan (AAP) on a

yearly basis to the U.S. Department of Labor. This process, coordinated by Title IX/EO, examines the numbers and classifications of employees. Within the AAP one of the employee breakdowns is a job group analysis, which includes a category for Executives. This would include Vice Presidents, the Provost, the President and Deans. As we suggest with regard to Recommendation #37, **the AAP should be made public to ensure transparency and accountability with regard to progress on the composition of our leadership** and other populations on campus.

RECOMMENDATION #6: Support for Faculty and Student Leaders

The BRC report noted that the institution needs to be more intentional and proactive in support of faculty and student leaders. The Task Force supports this recommendation and wishes to add “staff” as well, as they are also a critical component of the campus community.

A number of strategies can advance this recommendation. **More leadership development should be provided for faculty and staff of color to gain additional skills and experiences to move up within the organization.** Human Resources and Faculty Development, as well as units and departments across campus, can develop such opportunities internally, or identify and use programs and conferences developed by outside organizations, such as the Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U), American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities (AJCU). **More mentoring and support should be provided to tenure-stream faculty of color, particularly mid-career faculty, to help them gain the ability to seek leadership roles** as their careers progress beyond tenure. Faculty Development and ODI currently sponsor SCU’s institutional membership as well as individual fees for faculty members to participate in programs offered by the National Council on Faculty Development and Diversity (NCFDD), and from time to time faculty leaders are offered opportunities to engage in professional and leadership development by their Deans or the Office of the Provost. More intentional cultivation of leadership among faculty of color can be pursued through these channels as well as others.

Support for academic and intellectual communities engaged with research around race, ethnicity, and diversity can yield important opportunities for mentoring, peer support and ultimately leadership among faculty of color. Therefore, **we recommend continued and expanded support for the development of academic communities devoted to the study of race, ethnicity, and intersectional diversity.** This can take the form of support for collaborative work between faculty and students engaged with examinations of issues pertaining to diversity and inclusion; grants for faculty engaged in research related to race and ethnicity; and greater flexibility for faculty engaged in intensive and time-consuming diversity work to adjust course loads. These approaches are also related to the BRC recommendation on faculty rewards (#20).

Further discussion should take place within Student Life and other divisions about ways to better support students who make major commitments to advance diversity and inclusion.

The BRC report mentioned the issue of payment, but other options could include course credit or staff support (as detailed in our discussion of BRC recommendation #11).

HIGH-MEDIUM PRIORITY AREAS

In the Leadership Area, the Task Force views this recommendation as high-medium priority:

- (4) Prioritize and maintain transparency about diversity and inclusion efforts

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

RECOMMENDATION #4: Transparency

The BRC report stressed the need for SCU to maintain and sustain transparency in its diversity and inclusion efforts.

The Task Force is in agreement with this recommendation, on which ongoing work is already taking place. We also note that this recommendation is closely connected to BRC recommendations #1, #2, #3, and #37.

The Task Force notes that more communication is needed when reports become available. **This report should be shared with the SCU community.** Subsequently, rather than assuming that the community knows where to look, **proactive communications should be made on at least a quarterly basis to share progress updates.** Positive recent examples of transparency include the President's email messages to the community in response to bias incidents and his communication informing the community that the BRC report was available and providing a link to the full report. We encourage all parties who are engaging in diversity and inclusion work to share information about their progress broadly within our community.

MEDIUM PRIORITY AREAS

The Task Force views as medium priority the recommendation to:

- (3) Integrate diversity and inclusion into language and communications

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

RECOMMENDATION #3: Language and Communication

The BRC report noted the need for consistency in how diversity and inclusion are framed throughout the institution.

The Task Force sees a need for more intentionality in terms of how diversity and inclusion are

portrayed in the different communications by the institution. For examples, **outlets such as the *Santa Clara Magazine*, social media channels, press releases, and University web pages should clearly communicate that diversity and inclusion work is a high priority for the institution, connected to our core values,** and requires consistent attention and evaluation.

This is related to #1, #2 and #4 and is closely connected to the need to clarify our fundamental message and what is meant when we communicate about diversity and inclusion. Especially during a time of budget and resource limitations, it is important to ensure that work on diversity and inclusion is presented as an essential priority that requires ongoing investments in order to attain and sustain excellence at SCU.

STRATEGIC PLANNING AND (RE)STRUCTURING

Under the area of Strategic Planning and (Re)Structuring, the Blue Ribbon Commission issued the following recommendations:

- (7) Engage the larger campus community in the development of university diversity and inclusion strategic planning
- (8) Facilitate diversity and inclusion strategic planning in units across campus
- (9) Finalize and clarify the chief diversity officer structure and role(s)
- (10) Designate a task force on the structure for diversity and inclusion
- (11) Designate a task force on the budget for diversity and inclusion

HIGH PRIORITY AREAS

The Task Force views all of the recommendations in this section as high priority.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

While we agree with the intent of the recommendations in this section, the Task Force believes that some modifications are necessary for effective implementation of the recommendations in this section, particularly recommendations 9 through 11.

RECOMMENDATION #7: Engagement of the Community in a University Strategic Plan

The BRC report argued that the university needs to develop an institution-wide diversity strategic plan.

The Task Force agrees with this recommendation, which is related to #8, facilitating diversity

and inclusion planning across campus, and aligned with #34, which calls for the development of a campus climate study.

We wish to emphasize that Goal 5 of the 2020 Strategic Plan focuses on diversity, as summarized in the introduction to this report. Progress on diversity and inclusion is not only in the interest of the people of color in the SCU community, but it is in the strategic interest of the university as a whole, and fundamentally integrated with our core mission and values as a Jesuit, Catholic university. So far, limited efforts have been made to move forward with Goal 5. The initial steps in 2015-2016 were paused with the establishment of the Blue Ribbon Commission and now the Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion. The recommendations in this report offer a road map for moving forward.

It is essential to ensure that all of the entities that work on diversity, inclusion and multicultural efforts on campus maintain viable communication links and collaborate with each other.

The consultations that the Task Force has conducted can be viewed as a start to this process. We recommend that the process of implementation continue with **a full campus-wide environmental scan and gap analysis** to determine where diversity and inclusion efforts are designed to take place (e.g. by looking at the specific charges and job descriptions associated with the offices and individuals currently engaged in diversity and inclusion work at SCU), along with a comparison of where and by whom diversity and inclusion work is actually happening. This will highlight both unmet needs and work that is being done without adequate formal recognition or compensation by members of the SCU community. Once this broad assessment is complete, gaps can be identified where certain critical needs remain unmet, where insufficient formal structures or roles are in place to handle certain necessary functions, or where informal work is occurring that may not be aligned with the official roles and responsibilities of certain offices or individuals. After that, **efforts must be made to fill those gaps**. Such an analysis should be a central responsibility of the body charged with overseeing accountability for these recommendations and their implementation, specifically the Council on Inclusive Excellence, as we detail in our discussion of recommendation #38 in the section on “Accountability and Future Implementation” in this report. Here, it is important to note that the Office for Diversity and Inclusion was formed in Summer 2013 after a gap analysis revealed an unfilled need to provide focused attention on the recruitment and retention of diverse faculty across the campus. Since SCU’s campus climate, programs, and needs have changed since then, it is time for an updated and more comprehensive institutional analysis.

RECOMMENDATION #8: Strategic Planning in Units Across Campus

The BRC report stressed the need for diversity and inclusion to be part of strategic planning in all facets of the university.

The Task Force supports this recommendation and notes that it aligns closely with recommendation #7 on engagement in strategic planning. As with #7, the Task Force would like to see both continued and expanded engagement and collaboration between all of the entities

that work with diversity, inclusion and multicultural efforts on campus.

The Task Force notes that diversity work occurs in numerous units throughout the campus and not exclusively in those units whose specific duties are primarily related to diversity and inclusion. **We encourage schools, departments, and offices throughout campus to engage in assessments of their work on diversity and inclusion, to develop plans to ensure progress, and to emphasize the importance of this work and its centrality to SCU's mission and values to their faculty and staff.**

As departments and offices conduct their program reviews, they should include a discussion of their efforts and plans (if any) related to diversity and inclusion. If such efforts and plans do not exist, they should be initiated. ODI and the Office of Assessment can offer support for units that wish to create strategic plans for diversity and inclusion.

Academic departments and offices should be encouraged to work on plans for both collective and individual participation in diversity and inclusion work. Deans can have conversations with Department Chairs on how to encourage participation in diversity and inclusion work. Faculty serving on review committees should be reminded that this type of work represents valuable service to the department and university. ODI and/or Faculty Development can offer to facilitate these conversations.

The Law School's Diversity Strategic Plan, as well as the efforts by the Dean of the Jesuit School of Theology (JST) to prioritize engagement in the study of race and racism by JST's faculty throughout the 2016-17, are two examples of how academic units across campus can emphasize the importance of diversity work among their faculty and staff. The Department of Religious Studies' statement of solidarity is another positive example of a unit stressing the importance of diversity and inclusion. Individual units should be encouraged to explore initiatives like these, and use them as a springboard for more detailed strategic planning around diversity and inclusion.

Academic departments have the opportunity to be more intentional in examining how their particular mission, goals and learning objectives help to foster a climate of diversity and inclusion. Departments can take cues from areas such as the Ethnic Studies Department, which focuses on the study and empowerment of historically marginalized racial and ethnic populations. The department prides itself on its diverse curriculum, collaborative research, and community engagement, and has been a long-standing supportive resource for students, staff, and faculty of color on campus as well as a crucial campus liaison for populations of African Americans, Chicanas/os and Latinas/os, Asian and Pacific Islanders and Native American/American Indians and the campus. They have been able to work closely with key stakeholders such as the Office for Multicultural Learning, the Multicultural Center, Residential Life, LEAD, the Ignatian Center, and other individual academic units to support its curriculum and research with campus programming ranging from workshops and symposia to graduation events.

In addition, **leaders in units across campus should make efforts to incorporate participation in diversity and inclusion work into performance reviews and reward structures.** The Division of Student Life offers a good example of the incorporation of diversity and inclusion efforts into the performance review process for its entire staff. Each individual who reports to the Vice Provost for Student Life is required to include information about participation in diversity and inclusion programming or activities in their annual performance review reporting process. Likewise, all staff in the Global Engagement Office are expected to participate in two events or programs on- or off-campus related to cultural or global diversity issues, and they must include an explanation of these activities in their annual performance reports.

RECOMMENDATION #9: ODI Leadership Structure and Role(s)

The BRC recommended that SCU “should have consistent full-time leadership that is dedicated to facilitating diversity and inclusion efforts across the campus.” The CECE report that accompanied the BRC report offered specific recommendations on how this leadership should look: “SCU should designate a CDO (Chief Diversity Officer) in academic affairs and a second CDO in student affairs. These CDOs can be persons who also hold other administrative titles, but should have expertise in diversity and inclusion.”

The Task Force did not reach an agreement regarding what the specific structure for diversity and inclusion leadership should be. Many models exist, in addition to the one recommended in the CECE report. We decided to **designate the Council on Inclusive Excellence**, as specified in the discussions of recommendation #10 below and our additional recommendation #38 on accountability and future implementation, **as the body responsible for determining the most appropriate structure.** In order to leave options open for various models to be considered, in this report we will refer to the “ODI leader” rather than using the term “Chief Diversity Officer” or “CDO,” as the BRC did.

The Task Force agrees with the BRC’s recommendation that **whoever leads ODI in its future form should have a formal seat on the president’s cabinet** in order to ensure a direct line of communication to other leaders on campus who can make important decisions regarding institutional priorities and resources.

The current position of Associate Provost for Diversity and Inclusion was originally designed to be a full-time position for an externally-hired tenured faculty member, but was subsequently reconstituted as a half-time administrative role for a tenured faculty member and filled by a professor from SCU. Following the inception of ODI, a full-time Director was hired as staff to support the office. A decision was made to revisit the structure of the office after an undesignated period of time to determine if this revised structure was sufficient.

We agreed that **ODI should have a full-time leader along with a staff member to provide support.** However, after much discussion, members of the Task Force did not reach consensus on whether ODI’s full time leader needs to be a tenured faculty member or whether he or she could be a diversity professional who does not also hold an appointment as a professor at SCU.

In the spirit of transparency, the Task Force wanted to acknowledge in this report the different viewpoints that were expressed in our discussions.

Arguments for a Tenured Faculty Role

Those advocating that the leader of ODI should be a tenured faculty role based their position on a number of points. One argument was that since the aim of the BRC and ODI is to change the culture of the university toward more diversity and inclusion, the head of ODI at times will need to take positions that upset the status quo. Tenured faculty cannot be fired for taking unpopular positions and opposing university hierarchies; thus, the strongest advocate for diversity in this position will be a tenured faculty member.

The second argument dealt with having credibility among the faculty. Hiring and retention of diverse faculty is one of the most important long term changes that can be made at the university. Hiring, tenure, and promotion committees are made up of tenured faculty. The only position in the university from which an ODI head can meaningfully influence these committees is as a tenured faculty member. This is not necessarily a product of prejudice or elitism on the part of the faculty. It is a function of the faculty tenure system that protects and ensures academic freedom - like the freedom to advocate for a more diverse and inclusive faculty, curriculum, and student body.

Other arguments focused on the need for this individual to have had a scholarly background of expertise on diversity issues, and the need to bring in someone external to the institution in order to avoid internal politics.

Arguments for a Non-Faculty Professional Option

Those who believed that the role could be a full-time professional presented several counterarguments. One was that there are many qualified professionals with experience in this area and who are accustomed to the administrative aspects of the role within higher education. Limiting the position to a tenured faculty role could eliminate a group of highly qualified individuals with Ph.D.'s who have relevant experience, but no interest in pursuing a tenured faculty role. Because they are not interested in faculty positions, they may choose not to engage in the forms of scholarly activity that would earn them a tenured faculty position at SCU. Furthermore, many of the individuals with the relevant expertise to lead ODI could probably pursue a tenured position in an Education department with an emphasis in Higher Education, but SCU's Education department, housed in the School of Education and Counseling Psychology does not include a Higher Education emphasis.

In response to the argument that tenured faculty members are in the best position to

affect change, the advocates of the non-faculty option presented the view that regardless of background or credentials, individuals in this role can develop credibility with different stakeholders at the institution, particularly in light of the progress that ODI has made over the past four years in its work around inclusive search training in academic departments and other units across campus.

Due to the lack of agreement and consensus, the Task Force agreed to indicate in our report that the Task Force was divided and direct the Council on Inclusive Excellence to make a determination. The Council on Inclusive Excellence is therefore asked as part of recommendation #9 to consider various models, including a formal CDO role, and make a decision regarding the future structure of diversity and inclusion leadership at SCU after they conduct a broad institutional assessment and consider the perspectives summarized above. Related to Recommendations #10 and #36 on continuous assessment, we also suggest ongoing reevaluation, in conjunction with future climate surveys, to ensure that the model in place is appropriate for SCU as the institution continues to make progress on the implementation of diversity and inclusion efforts including those contained in this report.

RECOMMENDATION #10: Ongoing Work on Structure for Diversity and Inclusion

The BRC report called for the development of a task force to address the structure for diversity and inclusion. This Task Force agrees in principle with the need for an analysis of the structure. However, we believe that this can and should be done without the development of another task force, but instead **the structure for diversity and inclusion should be determined, carried out, and periodically reassessed by a more long-term group on campus.**

As explained above, the Task Force recommends that **the Council on Inclusive Excellence be charged with the responsibility of examining all options and recommending a model for the structure for Diversity and Inclusion at SCU.** This is related to recommendation #9 above, and our recommendation #38, in which CIE is designated as the body primarily responsible for maintaining accountability.

As explained in the discussion of recommendation #7 above, we recommend that **CIE conduct a university-wide audit to determine all the offices and individuals who are currently tasked with diversity and inclusion work and compare their assigned roles with SCU's current diversity and inclusion needs.**

The Task Force also notes that discussions surrounding structure must be tied to discussions about budgetary needs, so that decisions on these two issues can be made together. Our suggested sequence of events is spelled out more clearly in the discussion of Recommendation #11 below.

The discussion of recommendation #38, added by this Task Force, provides more details about how this could be structured.

RECOMMENDATION #11: Budget and Fundraising

The BRC report recommended that a task force on the budget for diversity and inclusion be developed.

The Task Force understands the BRC's rationale for this recommendation. However, we do not endorse the establishment of a separate new task force on budget for diversity and inclusion. Decisions on budget will be closely tied to the decisions that are made regarding structure and other aspects of recommendations #9, #10, and #38 in this report, as well as ongoing work on all of the recommendations discussed herein. Therefore, budget decisions cannot be made by a temporary group such as a task force. They must be made by decision makers who have a central role in the allocation of financial resources, staffing decisions, and strategic planning at SCU, currently and in the long term. For these reasons, we propose the structure of accountability outlined in Task Force recommendation #38.

Here we wish to extend the scope of this recommendation, which focuses on budget issues, to a broader discussion of the need for adequate financial resources and ideas for how to start allocating or generating funds to support the recommendations in this report.

As we stated in the introduction, it is essential that budgetary resources be made available for diversity and inclusion efforts, in order to demonstrate a clear and visible commitment from the university to this important strategic priority. This is perhaps the most crucial aspect of facilitating progress on diversity and inclusion at the university. Additional funds must be made available to support the recommendations in this report, including, but not limited to, funds to support research that furthers diversity and inclusion, ongoing climate surveys, scholarships, faculty hiring and retention initiatives, staff support to properly resource units working centrally with diversity and inclusion, services and programming for underrepresented and underserved students, and many other important components of the diversity strategic plan.

The Task Force wishes to emphasize the need to provide funding to expand the necessary staff roles on campus to address gaps in current and future work around diversity and inclusion. Examples of staffing needs that came up in Task Force deliberations and in our consultations with individuals across campus include a staff member to support the needs of undocumented students on campus and sufficient support for academic units (many of which operate with a part-time staff member), various student of color organizations, and other underserved and underrepresented student populations.

Several preliminary steps must inform campus budgeting. These include: (1) a **systematic institutional review and climate survey**; (2) **identification of gaps**; (3) **identification of corresponding needs**; (4) **decision about diversity and inclusion structure at SCU**; and (5) **assessment of budget and resource needs based on the preceding steps**. Steps (1) - (5) can and should be completed in the next year. However, it is imperative that **action on these steps does not stall or halt current campus investments in diversity and inclusion where the work is**

already happening (e.g. in academic units or student centers and organizations) or where there are immediate steps recommended by the Task Force.

The Task Force recommends that **diversity and inclusion be considered a top priority as SCU transitions from the “quiet phase” of the current Capital Campaign, which focuses on a small number of priorities with an emphasis on capital projects, to the “public phase,” which will focus on a broader set of priorities identified in the Santa Clara 2020 Integrated Strategic Plan.** We also recommend that **fundraising efforts for diversity are developed through coordination and consultation between the Development Office and units currently engaged in diversity work.**

Meanwhile, several steps can be initiated immediately. These include but are not limited to:

- A. **The University Budget Committee should make an effort to identify areas where some funds can be redirected to ongoing efforts as well as some of the short-term budget needs identified in this report.** More broadly, **the University should reconsider the current incremental model of budgeting,** which makes it difficult to reallocate funds to important areas that are not already receiving budget allocations.
- B. **University Relations, in collaboration with members of the Board of Trustees or Board of Regents, should identify and cultivate potential donors who are already engaged in giving that supports underserved communities,** such as giving to Cristo Rey high schools. For these individuals, supporting scholarships for graduates of the National Cristo Rey Network to attend SCU would be a natural extension of their existing charitable efforts. A goal for Year One could be to find donors to support five full scholarships for students of color (at a price of about \$300,000 per scholarship). A second goal could be set to fund five more scholarships each year; collectively, this effort could make a meaningful contribution towards steady progress in our efforts to provide full funding to enable more students of color from low-income families to attend SCU. Because Cristo Rey schools have a work-study component to their curriculum that includes internships at local businesses, opportunities may exist to engage these companies in support of SCU scholarships as well.
- C. **University Relations, in collaboration with the Alumni Association, should engage alumni identity organizations, other alumni groups, and members of the current SCU community in fundraising campaigns to support endowed chairs that could be offered as part of target-of-opportunity hiring efforts.** This could help generate enthusiasm among alumni of color, while supporting recruitment efforts for faculty of color, and bringing in more senior faculty of color who can contribute to university leadership as well as broader support for students of color.
- D. **For the SCU Day of Giving, internal and external donors could be identified to offer challenge grants or matching dollars to encourage SCU community members and alumni to participate in targeted giving to support diversity and inclusion programs.** During the Spring 2017 Day of Giving, OML participated in the process and funds were raised to support programming and services for the Multicultural Center, Rainbow Resource Center and Office for Multicultural Learning. This is an example of an approach

that was untapped in the past. Another example was the recent (2016) event held by Chicano Latino Alumni Group, which raised \$100,000 at Grand Reunion and related events to establish the Francisco and Laura Jiménez endowed scholarship.

- E. **The Development Office should work with the Deans, Faculty Development, Sponsored Projects, Office for Diversity and Inclusion, Ethnic Studies Department, Women’s and Gender Studies Department, Student Life, and other units on campus to identify and pursue grants from foundations, corporations, government, and other external sources to support diversity and inclusion research, training, programming, scholarships, and more.** This might require an **upfront commitment of internal resources** to be matched by external funding.
- F. To the extent that short-term savings can be realized through some of the “low-hanging fruit” identified through the Sustaining Excellence project, the **funds that become available through Sustaining Excellence initiatives should be allocated to immediate budgetary needs associated with important strategic priorities such as diversity and inclusion.**

SCU should also consider pooling resources with existing and future networks, such as the AJCU, a subset of western Jesuit institutions, or other universities and colleges in the region, to coordinate efforts around faculty and staff of color support and recruitment (i.e. regional “cluster hiring” or support for trailing partners of faculty hires).

ACCOUNTABILITY AND FUTURE IMPLEMENTATION

As the Task Force was deliberating the BRC recommendations, it became clear that an additional recommendation must be made to address a need for accountability throughout the implementation process. Therefore, we are adding this recommendation:

- (38) Establish a structure for future accountability and implementation of BRC and Task Force recommendations

HIGH PRIORITY AREAS

This recommendation is viewed as high priority by the Task Force.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

RECOMMENDATION #38: Accountability and Implementation Mechanisms

SCU needs to establish a formal mechanism for accountability and continued decision-making as the institution proceeds with implementation of the BRC recommendations and the strategies outlined in this report.

The Task Force recommends that the **Council on Inclusive Excellence (CIE) be designated to serve as the body responsible for maintaining accountability and future progress, while the Office for Diversity and Inclusion monitors the implementation of the recommendations** by appropriate campus stakeholders as determined by the CIE. The Associate Provost for Diversity and Inclusion chairs the Council on Inclusive Excellence and the ODI Director serves on CIE and provides behind-the-scenes support to the Chair. A committee of the CIE should conduct the institutional assessment and gap analysis that we recommend in our discussion of BRC recommendation #7, and using the findings of this assessment, the CIE should decide upon the most appropriate structure for the Office of Diversity and Inclusion and its leadership, as suggested in our discussion of BRC recommendation #9.

To act in this new capacity, **the Council on Inclusive Excellence (CIE) must be restructured to consist of the individuals who are directly engaged in intersectional racial and ethnic diversity and inclusion initiatives** representing key constituencies throughout the university.

Representatives from each of the following units, and in particular individuals who deal directly with issues of diversity and inclusion in these units, should be invited to serve on the Council for Inclusive Excellence: Office for Diversity and Inclusion, Student Life, Office for Multicultural Learning, Global Engagement Office, LEAD Scholars Program, Faculty Development, Undergraduate Admission, Human Resources, Title IX/Equal Employment Opportunity office, Department of Ethnic Studies, Department of Women's and Gender Studies, Latina/o Faculty Group, Women of Color Network, Multicultural Center, Student Council on Inclusive Excellence, and Campus Ministry.

We also recommend that there be **a separate advisory board associated with CIE that consists of administrative leaders at the Dean, Vice Provost, and Vice President and Cabinet levels, as well as individuals from offices such as University Relations and University Marketing and Communication, and other groups such as the Alumni Association**, who can provide support in terms of generation of funds and allocation of other resources, including personnel, to move forward with the goals.

The purpose of this advisory board is to ensure that those who have the deepest and most detailed understanding of the resource needs related to diversity and inclusion have direct access to those in our community who have the most ability to generate financial support, and can communicate more broadly throughout the SCU community and with external constituents about the diversity and inclusion work at SCU. **This advisory board should meet with the CIE 2-3 times per year, while the CIE should meet monthly**, with progress reports on members' work

distributed to CIE members prior to each meeting. This could be done, for example, in the form of a shared document that is updated regularly. The regular reports called for in this recommendation are related to the implementation of recommendation #37, annual reports on diversity and inclusion activity, and #2, communication of a clear vision.

An example of how a potential accountability model could work can be seen in how the University responded to the Unity 4 requests and developed a process of ongoing accountability through regular meetings with the student leadership and periodic updates on the status of the demands at the quarterly open forums, to the Council on Inclusive Excellence, and in the form of online documents. This approach serves as guide to how SCU can proceed with maintaining accountability with regard to progress on the Blue Ribbon Commission's recommendations and the more specific recommendations for implementation from this Task Force.

STUDENT RECRUITMENT AND ADMISSIONS

Under the area of Student Recruitment and Admissions, the Blue Ribbon Commission issued the following recommendations:

- (12) Designate a task force on college access to develop a plan for making recruitment and admissions processes more inclusive and equitable
- (13) Set a goal to become a need-blind institution permanently, and develop a concrete strategy to make it financially feasible
- (14) Set measurable student representational diversity goals to reflect the demographics of the state of California
- (15) Prioritize capacity to contribute to diversity and inclusion in the review of student admissions applications
- (16) Enhance the diversity and inclusion component of admissions and orientation programs
- (17) Establish partnerships with pipeline programs to enhance recruitment efforts to diversify the student body
- (18) Establish and strengthen intentional partnerships with employers

HIGH PRIORITY AREAS

The recommendations viewed as high priority by the Task Force in this area include:

- (12) Designate a task force on college access to develop a plan for making recruitment and admissions processes more inclusive and equitable
- (13) Set a goal to become a need-blind institution permanently, and develop a concrete strategy to make it financially feasible

- (14) Set measurable student representational diversity goals to reflect the demographics of the state of California
- (16) Enhance the diversity and inclusion component of admissions and orientation programs

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

RECOMMENDATION #12: Task Force on College Access

The BRC report recommended that SCU create a formal task force on college access in order to develop more concrete plans on making the enrollment and financial aid process for inclusive and equitable.

The Task Force supports this recommendation in principle but we recommend that the **appropriate offices (including Undergraduate Admission, Financial Aid, and Development) discuss and determine the specific form of this group**, including whether it should be a short-term “task force” or an ongoing “working group.”

In consultation with leadership and staff from the Undergraduate Admission Office, we learned that SCU has success attracting students of color among our applicants, and students of color are also well-represented among admitted students, but it is at the enrollment stage that we lose many of the students who have been recruited, due to limited resources for scholarships and financial aid. Therefore, **any task force or working group that will work on college access for students of color needs to have access to fundraising channels**. This recommendation is related to our discussion of recommendation #11, which includes more detail about potential sources of scholarship funding.

At SCU, diversity recruitment efforts are already taking place within Undergraduate Admission and are supported by efforts such as the University Open House and Preview Days led by the individual colleges and departments, with participation from many groups such as the LEAD Scholars program (first generation students), and the Multicultural Center. SCU’s Graduate Admissions offices operate independently from Undergraduate Admission. **Representatives from the offices responsible for Graduate Admissions should work together with Undergraduate Admission to share ideas and best practices for increasing diversity efforts with regard to recruitment, admissions, and financial aid, and where appropriate, coordinate their efforts** with regard to all of the recommendations in this section.

The Task Force would also like to encourage the members of the task force or working group established through this recommendation to **consider developing closer partnerships with other institutions working on issues of college access in the local area**, including other colleges and universities, community colleges, high schools, and other community-based organizations.

RECOMMENDATION #13: Need-Blindness and Financial Feasibility

The BRC report recommended that SCU become a “need-blind” institution. The Task Force believes that this recommendation needs to be further explored and considered as part of a broader strategic effort to attract more students of color regardless of their socioeconomic background.

With regard to this recommendation, it is important to clarify the distinction between an institution being need-blind and an institution that meets full need. Need-blind admission is a term used in the United States denoting a college admission policy in which the admitting institution does not consider an applicant’s financial situation when deciding admission. Generally, an increase in students admitted under a need-blind policy and needing financial aid requires the institution to support such a policy with an ample source of funding to meet the full demonstrated financial need of all its admitted students. Therefore, “need-blindness” and “meeting full need” are distinct concepts, both of which have budget implications.

The Task Force has learned that SCU considers itself “need aware,” but due to lack of funding, at this time the university is unable to expand this to full “need blindness” with the ability to meet full need. We would like the university to **set a long-term admissions and financial aid goal of need-blindness and meeting full need**. With this in mind, it is crucial to reiterate that goals like this one cannot be accomplished without **more concerted fundraising efforts for scholarships and financial aid**, as discussed in connection to recommendation #11 in this report.

SCU should leverage merit scholarships to bring in more economic and racial/ethnic diversity among our students. The university currently offers a few fully-funded scholarships. These include the Johnson Scholarships and Presidential Scholarships. Some of these scholarships also offer funding beyond tuition (e.g. room and board, travel home, etc.). Provost’s Scholarships provide half of tuition, and Dean’s Scholarships vary in tuition support. There also exist various categorical merit and need-based scholarships, such as the Los Angeles Catholic School Scholarship, Schmidt Scholarship, Horatio Algers-Schott Scholarship, and Future Teachers Project. **The offices responsible for administering these scholarships should make a greater effort to recruit students of color to apply for these opportunities, encourage students of color who have been identified as potential candidates to complete the application process, and review selection processes so that applicants of color are not eliminated from the selection process earlier than necessary.** If some of these merit scholarships could be **designated for students of color**, this could help increase the financial aid available for targeted populations.

In considering this recommendation, it is important to be aware that Financial Aid is responsible for dispersing aid to students. Financial aid awards are based on students’ completion of the CSS/Financial Profile in addition to the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA). Students may receive merit aid based on their academic credentials. Therefore, **applicants of**

color should be reminded, encouraged, and assisted as much as possible in the processes of completing the FAFSA and other paperwork.

RECOMMENDATION #14: Representational Goals for the Student Population

The BRC report indicated that SCU needs to be more explicit in setting representational goals so that the undergraduate student population more closely resembles the demographics of the state of California.

As with recommendation #12, the Task Force recommends that **experts working in the area of admissions be consulted for help in setting representational diversity goals.**

Demographic data for students, faculty and staff are currently available through our online Diversity Dashboard, but the dashboard does not include a formal comparison of the diversity statistics at Santa Clara University compared to the demographic composition of California. In Inclusive Search training currently conducted by ODI, State of California data are used for comparative purposes. The university has no existing guidelines suggesting that the institution's demographics mirror those of the State of California, Santa Clara County or the United States. In addition to **using State of California demographic data as a potential guideline to measure campus diversity**, the Task Force recommends the adoption of additional goals to increase representation among specific under-represented populations. These goals include:

- **Increasing the percentage of African-American/Black students**, as called for by Unity 4.
- **Making SCU eligible to apply for Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) status** as a preliminary goal, but **aspiring in the longer-term to greater representation of Latina/o students, staff and faculty beyond those initial numbers.**⁴
- **Disaggregating data on Asian American students and setting corresponding goals to improve representation of underrepresented Asian and Pacific Islander subgroups.**
- **Increasing the percentage of Native American/American Indian students.**

RECOMMENDATION #16: Admissions and Orientation Programs

The BRC report called for the institution to be more proactive in enhancing diversity and inclusion in the admissions and orientation programs.

⁴ Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs) are defined in Title V of the Higher Education Act as not-for-profit institutions of higher learning with a full-time equivalent (FTE) undergraduate student enrollment that is at least 25 percent Hispanic. The federal definition can be found here: www2.ed.gov/print/programs/idueshsi/definition.html. The benefit of gaining HSI status would be the opportunity to access Department of Education grant funding that has been specifically set aside for HSIs through an application process. If awarded, such grants can be used for the development and improvement of academic programs, endowment funds, academic tutoring, counseling programs, student support services, and more. These grants enable HSIs to expand and enhance their academic offerings, program quality, and institutional stability. It is important to note that Santa Clara would need to formally apply for consideration to become eligible for HSI status, which is not automatically conferred upon reaching the 25% threshold.

Diversity and inclusion components in the admission and orientation programs are critical in helping to build the cultural competency and capacity of incoming students while upholding diversity as a central feature of the university's mission and values. The Task Force strongly encourages the institution to continue to build upon existing efforts in this area through examples such as the overnight programs, intentional inclusion of a diversity discussion in Orientation, training of the Orientation leaders, and ensuring that the Orientation leaders are reflective of the increasing diversity on the SCU campus.

Currently, Undergraduate Admission organizes a number of overnight programs aimed specifically at addressing the needs of underrepresented students of color. These include SADIE (Students of African Descent Experience), APEX (Asian Pacific Islander Experience), and Noche Latina (aimed at Latina/o students) programs. This year, Undergraduate Admission added a new program aimed at Native American/American Indian/Indigenous students entitled NEX (Native American Experience). These programs have a measurable impact on improving the recruitment of first-year students of color at SCU while strengthening and enhancing the community of diverse students, staff, and faculty.

The Task Force supports the recommendations listed in the BRC report to **continue to enhance and expand overnight programs for incoming students of color**, through efforts such as **providing travel funding for low-income students to ensure they have access to overnight programs**, and **providing translators who meet the needs of non-English speaking families** who attend admissions events.

In the Orientation process, overseen by the Center for Student Involvement in the Division of Student Life, Orientation Leaders currently go through Perspectives training, and are then trained to facilitate an "Identity-Tree" activity, which is one of the components of the Diversity & Inclusion Series. Perspectives is a committee of students, staff and faculty who facilitate diversity workshops that aim to help SCU students shift their perspectives, gain diverse knowledge, and build multicultural skills. This is coordinated through the Office for Multicultural Learning.

A new Diversity and Inclusion Series was introduced during Orientation in Summer 2016. It includes three components that begin during Orientation and concludes in the Fall quarter.

- The first component, the "Establish" piece, takes place during Orientation itself. This component is focused on better understanding how Jesuit and Ignatian perspectives on inclusion and social justice help to explain how gender, class, race, ethnicity, language, nationality, sexual orientation, age, religion or spirituality, and disability and ability affect individuals and their experiences. The goal is for students to recognize their behavior and its impact on others.
- The second component is the "Explore" piece, which happens post-Orientation through online video modules. The video modules focus on the concept of challenge and how students can shift their own values, assumptions, and biases that may perpetuate

injustice or oppress others. The goal is for students to respond to microaggressions and examine the nature of institutional oppression, power, and privilege.

- The third and final component is “Embrace,” which takes place in small groups once students arrive on campus for the Fall quarter. The main focus is to identify and openly discuss cultural differences and issues, explore campus climate at SCU, introduce students to the dangers of aversive racism, and advocate for diversity and inclusion. The goal is for the students to develop a personal commitment to creating social change and combating oppression.

The Office for Multicultural Learning, in conjunction with Student Life, has been updating the Diversity and Inclusion Series based on feedback received and preparing for its implementation during Orientation 2017. The Task Force is encouraged by this initiative, which directly addresses a recommendation made by the Blue Ribbon Commission, and recommends that it continue to be strengthened.

MEDIUM PRIORITY AREAS

The Task Force views these recommendations as medium priority:

- (15) Prioritize capacity to contribute to diversity and inclusion in the review of student admissions applications
- (17) Establish partnerships with pipeline programs to enhance recruitment efforts to diversify the student body

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

RECOMMENDATION #15 Holistic Review of Applications

The BRC report encouraged SCU to be more holistic in their review of student applications.

The Task Force supports this recommendation, which was also a key component in the Unity 4 recommendations, and acknowledges that Undergraduate Admission is currently making efforts to do this. For example, the Undergraduate Admission review rubric, which was actually already in use prior to the Unity 4 recommendation, focuses on 2/3 academics and 1/3 non-academic characteristics. We recommend that **Undergraduate Admission review the effectiveness of the application evaluation process on a continuing basis, while considering best practices at other institutions**, to ensure the most equitable admission decisions. We also recommend that the **Graduate Admissions offices at SCU also consider adopting holistic review processes** if they have not done so already.

In addition to the recommendations about admissions processes, the Task Force wishes to

emphasize that efforts must be made to increase the yield of students who have been admitted. This focus on yield is directly related to recommendation #13 and the need for increased financial aid. In the consultation process, representatives from Undergraduate Admission indicated that **more entities on campus should get involved in efforts to improve the yield of students**. While the colleges and faculty and staff in individual academic departments already contribute considerable amounts of time and effort to organizing and executing the campus Open House in fall and Preview Days in Spring Quarter, more outreach from additional entities would be helpful. Mindful of the BRC's concerns that this additional labor tends to impose a "cultural tax" on faculty, staff and students already engaged in campus diversity work, the Task Force recommends that **any additional work to assist with student recruitment should be carefully coordinated, compensated, and voluntary for the faculty and staff of color and students**.

In terms of yield, a number of offices do play a role in helping to follow up with newly admitted students. Several of these efforts are described under recommendation #16. In addition, the School of Engineering coordinates a call campaign and has funded travel for select underrepresented students to attend the diversity overnight and Preview Day programs, and the MCC and the respective groups write postcards that are sent to potential incoming students. As with all of the other recommendations in this section, **we encourage our Graduate Admissions offices to consider expanding targeted outreach efforts to increase the yield for admitted students of color**.

RECOMMENDATION #17: Pipeline Programs

The BRC report called for the university to expand and establish more formal partnerships in the development of pipeline programs to help enhance recruitment efforts.

The Task Force agrees on the importance and value of this recommendation. Pipeline programs are not only valuable to help inform participants about Santa Clara, but also to prepare them for higher education in general through test preparation, guidance about financial aid, "College 101"-type skill development, and other related areas.

SCU currently partners with some pipeline programs.

- The Future Teachers Project (FTP) is SCU's longest standing, mission-centric pipeline program. FTP aims to recruit high school students of color who want to be schoolteachers in underserved communities. In 2016, they celebrated 20 years of success and currently have over 85 graduates. FTP is facilitated by the Child Studies Program.
- Breakthrough Silicon Valley is another potential pipeline program that SCU is partnering with in 2017 for the second year. Breakthrough is a summer and school-year academic program for talented and motivated junior high students from underserved communities. Students take classes in math, science, history and English and experience engaging activities like theatre, music, art and athletics. Breakthrough students agree to be a part of the program for six years, attending class every day for six weeks during

their 7th, 8th and 9th grade summers; after-school classes two to four days a week during middle school years; two “Super Saturday” enrichment activities each year; and our College Bound program during high school. Breakthrough’s summer academy takes place for 6 weeks at SCU and is sponsored by the Office of the President and the Child Studies Program.

- The Multicultural Center and the clubs associated with the MCC work with Undergraduate Admission to coordinate tours for different school groups and to coordinate panels of current students. Youth Empowerment Program (YEP) is a coordinated program through MCC, led by students to increase middle school and high school student interest in college and SCU by giving tours and open discussions. While this is not formally a pipeline program, it does build relationships with younger students in the local area.

The Task Force understands that no one office is responsible for the coordination of pipeline efforts nor has oversight for these efforts. It is clear that more coordination is needed for the different pipeline efforts that currently exist. It would be valuable to **form a standing committee that includes various individuals who currently are engaged in working with pipeline programs**. Together, they should **identify and evaluate the effectiveness of current SCU pipeline programs**, such as those listed above. The standing committee could also work on **a better articulation of the value of these programs and development of a plan for how SCU will handle applicants from these programs**.

This **standing committee should also examine best practices and models for successful pipeline initiatives**, such as [Saint Joseph’s University’s ICC Summer Programs for High School Students](#), and **develop and track results from future partnerships with outside pipeline organizations**.

OTHER PRIORITY AREAS

The recommendation viewed as other priority by the Task Force in this area is:

- (18) Establish and strengthen intentional partnerships with employers

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

RECOMMENDATION #18: Partnerships with Employers

The BRC report noted the need for more intentionality in how SCU interfaces with the local business community on diversity and inclusion, pointing out how this can be a mutually beneficial relationship. The Task Force supports this recommendation and understands that this is an area of interest/concern for the parents/families of potential and current SCU students.

The Task Force recommends **assigning a staff member or team to take on the responsibility**

for engaging with diversity officers at various Silicon Valley companies and in the greater Bay Area. Such an effort could be housed within Career Services, or it could involve collaboration between Career Services and other offices, such as the Alumni Association, the Leavey School of Business, and/or various academic units. Relationships developed through such an effort could be a source of valuable information for student groups as well as individual students of color. **Programs could be developed to provide targeted career fairs, mentoring, internships, job shadowing opportunities, and informational interviews to underserved/underrepresented students from all majors** (not just those in Business or STEM fields). Because a significant number of students of color, and particularly women of color, are concentrated in humanities and social science disciplines that are often underrepresented in such career opportunities, **special attention should be afforded to establishing relationships that further those connections for students in humanities and social science departments.** In addition, such programs could be used as marketing/recruitment tools for incoming students at SCU. **Once these relationships and programs are established, the coordinator(s) should be sure that they are well-publicized through Undergraduate Admission and University Marketing and Communications.**

Currently, SCU does have a wide range of relationships with the local business community. Some of these are tied to different units in the university, such as the Miller Center for Social Entrepreneurship, the Ignatian Center, the Markkula Center, and Leavey School of Business. Other relationships are cultivated by faculty members within departments. In addition, the Career Center is the main conduit for the various Career fairs that take place on the campus.

With that in mind, the Task Force recommends that we **leverage existing relationships such as those that have already been cultivated by the Ignatian Center, the Miller Center, Leavey School of Business, Career Center, Alumni Association, and some student organizations such as the National Society of Black Engineers (NSBE), the Society of Hispanic Professional Engineers (SHPE), the Leavey Black Business Association, Latino Business Student Association, certain multicultural Greek organizations that have members who are SCU students, and others,** on an ongoing basis. The BRC raised the need for a better coordination and engagement strategy in this area.

This past spring, the Office for Multicultural Learning offered target programming for Juniors and Senior students of color geared towards the unique challenges student may face in the workplace because of their identities. **Programming on this topic could be coordinated with diversity offices at local companies.**

CAMPUS SUPPORT SYSTEMS AND LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES

Under the area of Campus Support Systems and Learning Opportunities, the Blue Ribbon Commission issued the following recommendations:

- (19) Create a task force to enhance diversity in the curriculum
- (20) Adopt policies to integrate inclusion into faculty rewards
- (21) Create an inclusive first-year experience agenda
- (22) Support the development and expansion of culturally relevant leadership opportunities
- (23) Host quarterly diversity and inclusion forums on campus
- (24) Designate a task force on Greek Life to revisit the relationship between the university and Greek organizations
- (25) Develop a plan to enhance diverse alumni engagement

HIGH PRIORITY AREAS

The recommendations considered high priority by the Task Force in this area include:

- (19) Create a task force to enhance diversity in the curriculum
- (20) Adopt policies to integrate inclusion into faculty rewards
- (21) Create an inclusive first-year experience agenda
- (22) Support the development and expansion of culturally relevant leadership opportunities

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

RECOMMENDATION #19: Diversity in the Curriculum

The BRC report suggested that SCU create a task force to focus on ways to enhance the diversity in the curriculum.

The Task Force agrees with the spirit behind this recommendation. As SCU undergoes continuing assessment review of the Core curriculum, as well as other courses we offer, **a task force or working group should be formed to work on ways to improve our incorporation of diversity in the curriculum.**

Keeping in mind the goals of taking a holistic, efficient, and effective approach to expanding diversity in the curriculum and enhancing pedagogy, we recommend that the task force or committee be tethered to the existing Faculty Core Committee on diversity, the office of

Faculty Development, and the Office of Diversity and Inclusion (if ODI is led by a faculty member in the future), and that it work in consultation with the Office of Assessment. The committee should include the Chair of the Faculty Core Committee on Diversity, members of the committee whose position is by appointment (e.g. Ethnic Studies and WGST representatives), the Associate vice Provost for Faculty Development, the Director of the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, and a student representative from either Unity 4 or the MCC. The Office of Assessment should be available for consultation.

The committee should be charged with (1) finding ways to expand the teaching of diversity in the Core curriculum, by considering options such as expanded course requirements, such as adding a class or structuring classes into a sequence that is taken in the first years of students' time at SCU; (2) developing opportunities for faculty to enhance their engagement with intersectional diversity in their courses, including expanding opportunities for training on culturally inclusive teaching (related to BRC recommendation #33), (3) supporting the faculty teaching in the diversity core; (4) addressing shortcomings identified in the Core assessment; and (5) examining options such as removing one pathway requirement in order to add a second class to the diversity core, which was one of the Unity 4 requests.

In addition to the above, **the task force or working group on diversity in the curriculum should develop a structure for faculty training to ensure that course content is appropriate and effective at accomplishing learning objectives related to diversity.**

Individuals who were consulted by the Task Force mentioned that diversity can also be incorporated into other aspects of the Core curriculum such as Experiential Learning for Social Justice (ELSJ) courses and Culture & Ideas (C&I) courses. The **integration of diversity into ELSJ and C&I, or into additional Pathway courses** (beyond those already explicitly dedicated to this work), could complement the reach of the current diversity core courses, through training developed by the curriculum diversity working group.

An assessment of the Diversity Core was done in Spring/Summer 2016. The Office of Assessment's report, made available in 2017, provides insight into some needs associated with the Diversity Core. This assessment concluded that "Core goals for diversity are being partially met and that there is room for improvement. Faculty teaching Core Diversity courses can follow up by discussing strategies for developing assignments and other learning experiences that will deepen and advance student learning in this area, especially in raising awareness of intersectionality and its impact on privilege or marginalization." The Task Force also notes that **it would be beneficial for future assessment reports to include more information about where shortcomings in Diversity Core courses are centered** (for example, while there are substantive differences in Core courses that emanate from departments where faculty are trained in diversity research and continually engaged in the production of intersectional interdisciplinary research, the assessment data do not distinguish between these classes and those offered in departments where faculty have no such training or ongoing engagement). Additional assessment data are necessary to understand the impact of Core diversity classes and to fine-tune training programs to ensure and increase effectiveness in meeting the learning

outcomes. This topic is tied to our discussion of ongoing assessment needs related to BRC recommendation #36.

The Core assessment also found that the three-part diversity workshops recently introduced for all first-year students (discussed in detail in our section on BRC recommendation #16) “may strengthen diversity learning especially for white students and lead to fewer negative cross-racial interactions for students of color.” This finding suggests that along with courses in the Core curriculum, there are other effective ways to promote learning about diversity.

RECOMMENDATION #20: Faculty Rewards

The BRC report noted the need for the university to incorporate diversity into faculty evaluations and promotion processes. The Task Force agrees with this recommendation in principle, but disagrees with the specific approach recommended by the BRC, which focused on developing new questions to add to student evaluation forms.

The Task Force notes the potential to gauge impressions of inclusion in teaching evaluations but we believe that a more meaningful assessment would be to **evaluate actual student knowledge about diversity with other forms of assessment such as a pre/post-test**. It is important for those conducting and reading evaluations to be aware of disparities that may emerge due to bias in teaching evaluations, particularly for women and faculty of color. Therefore, caution must be exercised when relying on course evaluations that students provide to instructors, including and specifically, quantitative and qualitative evaluations used in both evaluations of merit and in the tenure and promotion processes.

In terms of faculty review as well as cases of Promotion and Tenure, a concrete step that can be made in the short term is to **provide training for department colleagues and Rank and Tenure committee members to understand and recognize issues of bias that might impact the evaluations of women’s and faculty of color’s dossiers and understanding of their contributions in research, teaching, and service**. In addition, **faculty who are seeking tenure and/or promotion should be encouraged to explain how their work at SCU engages with the commitment to diversity spelled out in the campus mission and values as well as in SCU’s strategic plan**. These statements should be part of the evaluation process at every stage of the tenure and promotion processes with faculty who have a demonstrated commitment to diversity being rewarded for these efforts. These same statements should also be part of the Faculty Annual Report (FAR), with faculty similarly rewarded for demonstrated work in diversity that supports the mission and strategic plan of the university.

The university needs to **provide more intentional mentoring of women and faculty of color as they prepare for the promotion and tenure process**. This is linked to Recommendation #32 on professional development opportunities aimed at promoting faculty success.

While these recommendations are focused primarily on faculty, equivalent **training can be introduced for staff members and those who conduct annual performance reviews and**

consider staff contributions for awards and other forms of recognition.

Finally, the Task Force notes that in addition to valuing faculty work in the area of diversity during tenure and promotion, the institution also needs to **properly compensate faculty and staff whose work is instrumental to promoting diversity at SCU**. The issue of compensation and recognition is related to other recommendations but bears repeating as the BRC report noted that significant “cultural taxation” is often experienced by faculty and staff who do uncompensated diversity work with insufficient recognition.

A number of awards are currently designated to recognize faculty excellence with diversity. For example, the Council on Inclusive Excellence awards the Francisco Jimenez Inclusive Excellence Award for Faculty, and there is also a Staff Inclusive Excellence Award. While recognition in this form is valuable, **other forms of recognition, particularly those that come with compensation in terms of money or time (e.g. faculty course releases), should be developed at all levels of the university for individuals who make substantial contributions to the university around diversity and inclusion.**

RECOMMENDATION #21: First-Year Experience

The BRC report expressed the need for SCU to establish an inclusive first-year agenda that would include culturally related first-year experiences.

The Task Force supports this recommendation and notes that numerous concrete steps to accomplish this goal are already underway.

- The LEAD Scholars Program is a program for first-generation college students (students whose parents did not graduate from a 4-year college or university) focused on academic success and community engagement. This program is open to both first-year students and transfer students with the goal of supporting them throughout their college career. The LEAD scholars program is a key player in this area and is expanding due to new funding from the Koret foundation. This funding ends at the conclusion of the 2019-2020 academic year. **The Task Force recommends that the institution prepare to sustain this growth in subsequent years by identifying and cultivating future funding sources.** To do this, SCU administration must prioritize LEAD services and programming as a funding priority to be implemented in a joint effort by University Relations and LEAD.
- In Summer 2016 as part of Orientation, Student Life unveiled a new Diversity Series based on the Unity 4 recommendations. This new series includes three parts – during Orientation discussions take place in small groups (facilitated by Orientation Leaders); post-Orientation, students view Diversity video modules, and once school starts, students participate in another small-group diversity discussion (held in October/November). More detailed discussion of this program can be found in our discussion of BRC recommendation #16.

- Related to the first-year course, Student Life is also taking a closer look at the different mentoring opportunities that exist and ways that we can connect these efforts. Mentoring opportunities exist through LOOP mentoring program (Office for Multicultural Learning), LEAD Scholars, Rainbow Resource Center through Rainbow Buddies and such groups as AWIS (Association for Women in STEM). Beginning Fall 2017 the LOOP peer mentorship program will seek to provide targeted support to student of color and first generation not in the LEAD scholars program. The Task Force recommends the **creation of a more formal inventory of mentoring opportunities for students of color and potential gaps**. This could be coordinated through the Office for Diversity and Inclusion with a formal report to the Council on Inclusive Excellence.
- Student Life is currently pursuing the development of a “Being a Bronco” Series which would be a course for all first-year students in the initial Fall quarter. This series would highlight such areas as sexual assault, alcohol, diversity, and other topics. It is still in the discussion phase but there is the potential for credit, using the Camino online learning management system for the assignments, etc. Student Life is prepared to fund the initial pilot, but **if this program is adopted, sources of additional budget support should be identified and pursued to sustain the effort in subsequent years**.
- The Alumni Association organizes a series of welcome receptions for new students at the start of the Fall quarter. Each of these receptions varies but they provide an opportunity for students of color to directly engage with alumni and faculty/staff of color.

The Task Force appreciates all of the efforts outlined above, and encourages the university to be more intentional in how it incorporates discussions of diversity and inclusion issues as it welcomes and introduces all new members of the university community including students, faculty and staff.

RECOMMENDATION #22: Leadership Opportunities

The BRC report emphasized the need for SCU to continue to support culturally relevant leadership opportunities.

The Task Force supports this recommendation, which is connected to our discussion of BRC recommendation #6 on proactively supporting faculty and student leaders. In addition to faculty and students, we also need to ensure that such opportunities are available to staff. Moreover, part of the development and expansion of leadership is the recognition and reward of faculty and staff who are already engaged in promoting inclusive leadership, cultural competency among leaders, and/or leading diversity work on campus, as we discuss in our sections on BRC recommendations #20 (faculty rewards) and #32 (professional development opportunities for faculty success).

We suggest that SCU build upon existing efforts rather than merely focusing on new ones. One way to start is to **take an inventory of leadership opportunities, and add new ideas to those that already exist**.

As a Task Force, we acknowledge that there are leadership opportunities that are directly culturally relevant, as well as other opportunities that are broader in focus but valuable for people of color in our community to pursue. It is also important for the whole community to have diversity among leaders in all aspects of our experiences at SCU. Members of the SCU community are encouraged to take advantage of the opportunity to get involved in a variety of leadership opportunities.

- For members of the faculty, some examples include opportunities within the Shared Governance; engagement in some of the different communities such as the Culture Power Difference (CPD) group, Women of Color Network, or Latina/o Faculty group; programs through the Ignatian Center including immersion trips and Bannan Institutes; serving as advisors to student organizations; and participation in ongoing professional development.
- For members of the staff, some examples include opportunities within shared governance; programs through the Ignatian Center including immersion trips and Bannan Institutes; serving as advisors to student organizations; and participating in ongoing professional development opportunities.
- For students, examples include getting directly involved with the cultural student organizations affiliated with the Multicultural Center (MCC); engagement with other student organizations including Associated Student Government; leadership roles such as serving as Community Facilitators (CFs), Orientation Leaders, or Ambassadors; participating in Campus Ministry; participation with the Office for Multicultural Learning (OML) and the Rainbow Resource Center (RRC); opportunities with the LEAD Scholars Program; and participating in immersion trips and the Experiential Learning for Social Justice (ELSJ) experiences through the Ignatian Center.

It is important to note that the flip side of leadership opportunities is often additional uncompensated work. Therefore, to echo the concerns we expressed in connection with recommendation #20 above, it is important that **leadership opportunities be tied to immediate or longer-term rewards for those who take them**, such as a reduction in teaching load, financial compensation, or professional upward mobility. The Task Force also wishes to emphasize that support for leadership opportunities can be provided in many forms, including funding or staffing. For example, student leaders who are deeply engaged in the MCC could be offered more staff support, as discussed in our section on BRC recommendation #11.

MEDIUM PRIORITY AREAS

The recommendations viewed as medium priority by the Task Force in this area include:

- (24) Designate a task force on Greek Life to revisit the relationship between the university and Greek organizations
- (25) Develop a plan to enhance diverse alumni engagement

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

RECOMMENDATION #24: Greek Life

The BRC report recommended that the university address the issue of the relationship between itself and Greek organizations.

The Task Force agrees that **this issue needs to be further studied and would warrant a formal working group or task force**. Our Task Force does not have a position on whether or not the University should re-establish official ties with Greek organizations.

In the consultation and discussion process, the Task Force learned that the issue of Greek Life is on the agenda of the Vice Provost for Student Life. The formal relationship between SCU and Greek organizations ended in 2003. Nonetheless, although the organizations have no official relationship with the institution, and are not allowed to reserve space on campus, hundreds of SCU students are members of these organizations. We also acknowledge that there are major financial considerations related to this recommendation, the scope of which is not yet known. The creation of a working group or task force, including representatives from Student Life, could also help to provide a careful look into the infrastructure that would be required to rebuild the engagement with the Greek organizations and that budgetary impact.

Regardless of the ultimate decision(s) regarding the structure of the relationship between the University and Greek organizations, our Task Force would like those who do make decisions on this topic to consider differences between the fraternities and sororities that have historically served largely white populations, and fraternities and sororities organized primarily by and for students of color. Often, Greek organizations are inappropriately bundled together, overlooking the distinct history and focus of those serving racial and ethnic minority populations. Any additional work to incorporate, supervise, and/or create structures of accountability aimed at Greek organizations should be mindful of these distinct histories and impacts and create appropriate responses based upon this difference. Greek organizations that are organized around student communities of color have a demonstrated impact on such students' sense of belonging, and recognition of such Greek organizations has the potential to positively impact the retention and recruitment of students of color.

Regardless of whether or not formal ties are re-established with Greek organizations, the Task Force agrees with the point raised by Unity 4 that **there needs to be engagement with students involved in fraternities and sororities around their role in the climate of inclusion and exclusion among students at SCU, especially those living off-campus**. Associated Student Government and representatives from Student Life can take the lead in initiating these conversations.

RECOMMENDATION #25: Alumni Engagement

The BRC report included a series of recommendations on ways to enhance the engagement of diverse alumni.

The Task Force agreed with the recommendations and in the consultation process discovered that the Alumni Association (AA) has already begun implementing some of recommendations and that the AA staff and Board of Directors have been making additional efforts.

The Task Force acknowledges these initiatives and sees an opportunity to better promote existing efforts with the broader community and to **include stronger connections with academic programs and faculty; expand mentoring opportunities between alumni and students of color; and provide more visible and tangible support for the identity-based alumni affinity groups.** We wish to emphasize that **more opportunities to engage in inexpensive or free programs could increase participation among younger alumni of color.**

Related to the recommendations on use of data and evidence (#35-37), there needs to be **improved data sharing and integration across offices**, including the Alumni Association. In their consultation with the Task Force, AA staff expressed challenges surrounding the confidentiality of alumni contact information that might impede efforts to connect alumni of color with current students of color, e.g. in mentoring opportunities. While students wish to connect with alumni, it is hard to share contact information. The Black alumni group is pursuing an “opt-in” option so that their members can agree to share information.

One immediate goal that the Alumni Association leadership has already identified as a priority is **increasing racial and ethnic diversity among the Alumni Association staff.** The Task Force supports this goal and believes that its achievement will improve the ability to provide appropriate support to SCU alumni of color.

During the 2016-2017 academic year, the Alumni Association has embarked on a change in the structure for what are now known as the identity-based groups within the Alumni Association. The groups include the Asian Pacific Islander Alumni Group, the Black Alumni Group, the Chicano/Latino Alumni Group, and the newly-established LGBTQ Alumni group. Each of the Alumni groups has a President, and some have Co-Presidents. The Task Force recommends that the Alumni Association **designate a full-time staff member solely to manage the identity-based groups**, in order to ensure adequate support and resources for this growing community.

While the Alumni Association is intentionally not directly engaged in fundraising, there are many opportunities for “passive fundraising” to support diversity and inclusion initiatives at alumni events organized by the Association. **The Alumni Association should work with other groups on campus including University Relations/Development, certain academic departments, Undergraduate Admission, and others to explore opportunities to collaborate on fundraising efforts.** Currently, the graduate schools at SCU tend to handle their own alumni

relations. There may be opportunities for **more coordination between the Alumni Association and graduate alumni activities to work together around identity groups and international alumni.**

OTHER PRIORITY AREAS

The recommendations viewed as other priority by the Task Force in this area include:

- (23) Host quarterly diversity and inclusion forums on campus

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

RECOMMENDATION #23: Quarterly Forums

The BRC report articulated the need for hosting quarterly diversity and inclusion forums on campus.

The Task Force agrees that regular public forums are necessary. Our decision not to designate this as “high priority” results from our recognition that this is already happening. Since Fall 2015, the university, in partnership with Unity 4, has held a series of quarterly forums. The forums have provided an opportunity for the university community to get updates on the status of the Unity recommendations, hear from university leaders, and to ask questions and address issues. While the forums have been focused on students, attendance has included faculty, staff and alumni. Typically the students have served as the moderators for the forums and have worked closely with the university leadership to finalize an agenda. In addition to the Unity 4 forums, SCU’s Associated Student Government (ASG) has coordinated “When It’s Not a Great Day to Be a Bronco” quarterly forums, focusing on ways to improve the university.

As Unity 4 begins to wrap up, this recommendation provides an opportunity to **institutionalize on an ongoing basis the practice of holding quarterly open forums**, as originally developed in response to the Unity 4 document.

We wish to add that programming related to contemporary diversity issues is already regularly organized by the Departments of Ethnic Studies, Women’s and Gender Studies, the Office of Multicultural Learning, the Multicultural Center, the Office for Diversity and Inclusion, Faculty Development, and other units on campus. These units in particular have sponsored annual as well as *ad hoc* workshops, symposium, dialogues, lectures, etc. on topics from racism and discrimination, gender and difference, religious intolerance, immigration and incarceration, to name a few of the ongoing programs. These units have also developed campus outreach and programming that regularly responded to significant cases of discrimination at SCU and have been sources of both information and support for the campus. As such, the Task Force recommends that **any future forums engage these key stakeholders as participants and planners while also seeking opportunities to extend the conversation and include the entire campus.**

FACULTY RECRUITMENT AND HIRING

Under the area of Faculty Recruitment and Hiring, the Blue Ribbon Commission issued the following recommendations:

- (26) Set faculty representational diversity goals
- (27) Maintain support for inclusive excellence postdoctoral fellowships
- (28) Allocate funds to strategically hire scholars committed to diversity and inclusion
- (29) Explore ways to pool resources across units to support hiring clusters of scholars committed to diversity and inclusion
- (30) Be more aggressive in meaningfully integrating diversity into all aspects of professional search processes
- (31) Respond to the need for new Ethnic Studies faculty hires to ensure equitable faculty-to-student ratios across campus

HIGH PRIORITY AREAS

The recommendations viewed as high priority by the Task Force in this area include:

- (26) Set faculty representational diversity goals
- (28) Allocate funds to strategically hire scholars committed to diversity and inclusion
- (31) Respond to the need for new Ethnic Studies faculty hires to ensure equitable faculty-to-student ratios across campus

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

RECOMMENDATION #26: Faculty Diversity Goals

The BRC report noted that SCU can and should set representational goals for faculty diversity.

The Task Force supports this recommendation and sees this as linked to BRC recommendation #5 on expanding diversity in campus leadership. As such **the Task Force supports tethering faculty diversity goals to key benchmarks** (e.g. reflecting the diversity of the state), but we are also mindful that diversity manifests itself differently in particular disciplines, requiring more attention to expanding opportunities in some than others. While this recommendation focuses on faculty, the Task Force also wishes to highlight that there is also a need explore the representational diversity of staff.

A focus on recruitment and retention of faculty of color was the primary stated purpose of the Office for Diversity and Inclusion (ODI) when it was established in Summer 2013. While the institution has not formally set specific numbers as hiring targets, ODI's focus in the recruitment

and hiring process has emphasized ensuring that applicant pools are diverse and reflect national availability data per any given discipline. ODI has been working with departments to craft job descriptions and to develop recruitment plans for more targeted outreach to different communities to enhance the diversity of their applicant pools so that there is a greater chance of a hire from an underrepresented group. ODI also sponsors “fourth candidates” (beyond the regular set of three finalists) if they enhance the racial or ethnic diversity of the applicant pool invited to interview on campus.

These efforts appear to have borne fruit. Since 2013, SCU has seen tangible statistical results showing greater gender parity in the Assistant Professor Ranks as well as additional improvements in racial and ethnic representativeness. The Assistant Professor ranks are getting closer to the demographic composition of our undergraduate student population. The proportion of faculty of color declines from Assistant professor to Associate Professor to Full. Recent cohorts of incoming tenure track faculty have been much more representative of the broader population in terms of gender and race/ethnicity.

While data on the demographic makeup of different cohorts of faculty offer hope that the racial and ethnic representativeness of our faculty will improve as older (and less diverse) faculty retire and as existing and new efforts continue to diversify the pool of new hires, the reality is that accelerated growth in faculty diversity will require additional financial investments in both faculty recruitment and faculty retention. As such, this recommendation is also related to #11 on budget, and #28 on allocation of funds. The diversity in our higher ranks can be improved through targeted hiring at all levels, especially senior faculty, along with concerted and coordinated efforts to retain the diverse faculty already present.

The Task Force recommends that **ODI conduct more exploration of the points in the recruitment, interview, and hiring process at which candidates of color are being cut from the applicant pool**, so that targeted efforts can be directed towards those junctures in the process. The Task Force also recommends **greater efforts to understand the circumstances that have prompted untimely departures of several existing faculty of color and attendant investments in retention of faculty of color**.

A recommendation that arose in the consultation process was **prioritize hiring people who are qualified and experienced in work with diverse communities**, so as to engage our increasingly diverse student population effectively. The selection of certain priority fields for hiring can also attract more diverse candidate pools, and the ability to do so can be tested through participation in the Inclusive Excellence Postdoctoral Fellowship program. **Participation in conferences offered through meetings of organizations that target graduate students and recent PhDs from underrepresented communities**, such as the PhD Project (which focuses on diversity among business school faculty), can provide opportunities for our faculty to meet potential candidates of color.

ODI, in partnership with Institutional Research, has started to track data across all levels of the university (faculty, staff and students) in an effort to better understand trends and needed

areas of emphasis. Some institutional goals are already laid out in the annual Affirmative Action Plan (AAP). For example, recent AAPs have indicated a need for more women in executive leadership roles, and more Asian American staff members. The Task Force has learned that this report is not currently available for review by members of the SCU community. As we suggest in our discussion of BRC recommendation #37, in the interest of transparency and accountability, we recommend that **SCU's Affirmative Action Plan be made available either publicly or by request.**

RECOMMENDATION #28: Funds for Strategic Hiring

The BRC report expressed the need for SCU to set aside funding for strategic hires and support for faculty of color and those doing diversity work.

The Task Force agrees with the recommendation. We view this area as central to fulfilling the university's mission and critical even in the midst of challenging budget times, as we discussed in the section on BRC recommendation #11 on budgeting. This recommendation is related to other recommendations such as #26 (faculty diversity goals) and #29 (resources, lines, and cluster hiring).

We wish to emphasize that this recommendation refers specifically to the need to **hire faculty with relevant academic experiences and demonstrated commitment to diversity-related work.** In other words, this recommendation goes beyond simply hiring faculty members to fulfill demographic representation goals and supports the hiring of racially and ethnically diverse faculty who can also enhance and support diversity goals in their research, teaching, and service.

When conducted with these goals in mind, targeted hires provide an opportunity for SCU to recruit and hire selected scholars in particular fields/disciplines, and by doing so, to raise our institutional profile. Targeted hires can be used to recruit and hire highly qualified junior scholars in departments where there is a need but no approved tenure track line. They can also be used to hire more senior faculty of color (both Associate and Full Professors) who have a commitment to diversity work and who could provide more support for junior faculty and students of color. Recruiting and hiring racially and ethnically diverse faculty is key to alleviating the extensive service demands borne by junior faculty of color while providing much-needed professional mentorship and academic support across campus. It also increases the pool of faculty of color who can engage in leadership roles at SCU, which could contribute to progress towards Recommendation #5, representational diversity in leadership. As such, the Task Force recommends **creating opportunities for targeted hires to be made when outstanding candidates of color are identified to fulfill known departmental needs outside the regular hiring cycle.** Discussions about how to create these opportunities should take place between the Provost, Deans, and department chairs.

As we recommend in our discussion of BRC recommendation #11 on budget, **Development and University Relations, with guidance from the Alumni Association, should initiate efforts to**

raise money for endowed professorships that can be used in the targeted recruitment of senior faculty members. The University should also **pursue ways to allocate or reserve funding to support targeted hires at the junior level** that correspond to specific department needs.

Where applicable, the **need to increase diversity should also be discussed by departments in their Program Review processes** and included as part of the rationale for future tenure-line requests.

Schools/Colleges and departments should also take advantage of opportunities whenever possible to bring in faculty of color as Visiting Professors or Professors of Practice, or in similar higher-profile non-tenured faculty positions.

RECOMMENDATION #31: Ethnic Studies Hires

The BRC report expressed the concern that given the concentration of diversity work that takes place within Ethnic Studies (in particular the concentration of racially and ethnically diverse faculty, students, and coursework and the accompanying advising, research, service and programming), the newly-formed department of Ethnic Studies is under-resourced and efforts should be made to remedy this through additional faculty hires.

Task Force concurs with the BRC's recommendation that **resources be made available to hire more faculty in the Department of Ethnic Studies**, and we recommend that **Department of Women's & Gender Studies**, which faces similar issues, **also be prioritized in the allocation of faculty hiring lines**. More details about the allocation and generation of funds to support these recommendations can be found in our discussions of BRC recommendations #11 (budget) and #28 (resources for strategic hiring). Moreover, in considering how many additional lines to allocate, the Task Force recommends that **an assessment be made of the volume of diversity work done within these units that goes beyond the typical faculty expectations**, rather than merely relying on a simple calculation of student-to-faculty ratio, as this overlooks and oversimplifies the complex and unique work that is being carried out in these units that is not duplicated elsewhere.

Ethnic Studies and Women's & Gender Studies became official departments in late Spring 2016. 2016-17 was the first academic year in which both were stand-alone departments and stand-alone majors. While both departments had unsuccessfully pursued the options of department status and stand-alone majors on multiple prior occasions and over the course of several decades, these efforts met with success in 2016 through the sustained efforts of faculty, staff and students, including student support from Unity 4, and with support from the Dean of Arts and Sciences, the Provost, the President and the Trustees.

Both departments went through the standard process outlined in the College of Arts and Sciences for requesting additional faculty lines. Both Ethnic Studies and Women's and Gender Studies are currently going through their respective program review processes. In 2017 the Ethnic Studies Department successfully secured a postdoctoral fellowship position through the

competitive process established by the CAS Dean and will welcome their first Inclusive Excellence Postdoctoral Fellowship in the 2017-2018 academic year. In addition, the proposal for a new tenure track position submitted by Ethnic Studies was recently approved and a new search will begin in 2017-18.

For a small department with few tenure-stream faculty members, the burden of search processes, tenure and promotion reviews, program review, and other forms of departmental service can be more intense. To address this problem, departments have the option to have non-department faculty participate on their search committees, albeit it is worth noting that neither Ethnic Studies nor Women's and Gender Studies views this as a favorable option. Until a larger critical mass of tenure-stream and tenured faculty exist in those departments, these challenges will continue to exist.

MEDIUM PRIORITY AREAS

The recommendations viewed as medium priority by the Task Force in this area include:

- (27) Maintain support for inclusive excellence postdoctoral fellowships
- (29) Explore ways to pool resources across units to support hiring clusters of scholars committed to diversity and inclusion
- (30) Be more aggressive in meaningfully integrating diversity into all aspects of professional search processes

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

RECOMMENDATION #27: Inclusive Excellence Postdocs

The BRC report expressed support for SCU in continuing its efforts with the inclusive excellence postdoctoral fellowships.

The Task Force agrees with this recommendation, which builds upon existing efforts, while noting that postdoctoral positions are secondary in importance to tenure-track hires. The potential exists to expand the postdoctoral initiative beyond the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), and the Task Force recommends that **other schools in the University consider adopting inclusive excellence postdoctoral fellowship programs, while opportunities in CAS should be sustained or expanded. Funding must be made available to support expansion of these opportunities** and to provide support for the individual academic units that recruit, house, and mentor the postdoctoral fellows.

During the 2015-2016 academic year, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences convened a committee to revamp and revise the existing postdoctoral program. The program was reconstituted with departments formally applying for postdoctoral opportunities under two different funding models. Model 1 is a 50:50 match to external funding. Under Model 1, the

department submitting the proposal needs to have an external guarantee for funding to be matched by the Dean's Office. Model 2 is 100% funded by the Dean's Office. The Office for Diversity and Inclusion served as a partner in the effort both during the planning process and the actual interview process that took place in 2016-17. Two Inclusive Excellence postdoctoral opportunities will be supported in academic year 2017-18 in Ethnic Studies and Political Science under Model 2, and a third Postdoctoral Fellow will be hosted in Math under Model 1.

The revised CAS Dean's Postdoctoral Program is a part of the newly-developed Jesuit Postdoctoral Consortium being coordinated by SCU that will have its first cohort in Fall 2017. The process for the next set of Postdoctoral Fellows for 2018-2020 has just started with the call for applications in the College of Arts and Sciences.

Related to our discussion of BRC recommendation #20 (faculty rewards), the Task Force recommends that **faculty colleagues who provide mentoring and other assistance to inclusive excellence postdocs in existing and new postdoc programs should continue to be recognized and rewarded for their efforts.**

RECOMMENDATION #29: Faculty Lines, Resources, and Cluster Hiring

The BRC report provided feedback on the need to prioritize faculty lines, provide resources for scholars committed to diversity and inclusion, and explore the development of focused cluster hires around diversity. The Task Force is in agreement with this recommendation and notes that it is related to recommendation #28 (allocation of funds). It also relates to #27 (support for postdocs).

The common definition of "cluster hires" as used by the Blue Ribbon Commission refers to bringing in a cluster of faculty, often in different departments, whose work can include interdisciplinary collaboration with faculty in other departments. This type of hiring would ideally involve coordination and collaboration between departments throughout the process of applying for new faculty lines and as they proceed with their searches. When possible, the Task Force also recommends **hiring multiple faculty to create a critical mass of engaged faculty of color who can provide professional and personal peer support**; the existence of such a network can contribute to retention among racially and ethnically diverse faculty.

Departments and Colleges/Schools should **consider using Target of Opportunity (TOP) hires to bring experienced scholars to SCU who represent underrepresented groups and are committed to diversity.** These types of searches and hires diverge from standard hiring processes because they may not entail open national searches and may occur outside the standard timetable for hiring tenure-track faculty. The Task Force recommends that the **university provide support for these types of hires, clearly articulate when and how these opportunities exist for individual academic units, and facilitate consultation between Deans and the Office of the Provost to use these hires to meet known needs (e.g. as identified in Program Review) to enhance diversity** among their faculty and in course offerings.

The Task Force **strongly recommends against the use of joint appointments to fulfill either TOP or cluster hiring.** Such arrangements have historically created uneven burdens and confusing expectations for junior faculty and have unintentionally worked against efforts to promote and retain diverse faculty. Departments should carefully consider whether such an appointment would be more beneficial than a full appointment in one department with a courtesy appointment in another. If a joint appointment is made nonetheless, the chairs of the two departments should reach a clear agreement regarding service and teaching that is reasonable and does not overburden the new faculty member, and make a well-articulated plan with regard to how faculty reviews will be conducted that is communicated clearly with the faculty member.

With regard to retention, the Deans work with the Office of the Provost to generate counteroffers when current faculty are being recruited away by outside institutions. As other universities pursue Target of Opportunity hires, we risk having our successful faculty of color poached away by other institutions. Because retention concerns tend to revolve around widely varying issues (e.g. location of a partner, prestige of the competitor institution, cost of living, etc.), it is difficult to develop a uniform policy around counteroffers to retain faculty members. However, as discussed in the section on BRC recommendation #26 above, efforts should be made to understand more clearly and address directly whenever possible the reasons for departure among faculty of color who are not retained.

As mentioned in association with Recommendation #11, **SCU should also consider collaborating with other universities and colleges in our geographic region to pursue efforts such as support for “trailing partners” of faculty hires or even a regional form of cluster hiring.** While such a consortium might be challenging to organize, it could prevent some faculty of color from being as easily recruited away by institutions outside this area.

RECOMMENDATION #30: Search Processes

The BRC report noted some additional ways that SCU can be more aggressive in meaningfully integrating diversity into all aspects of the professional search process.

The Task Force supports this recommendation and notes that many of the recommendations are already being implemented at SCU. For that reason, we did not designate this as high a priority as other recommendations in this section. For example, all tenure-track search committees are required to complete Inclusive Search training through the Office for Diversity and Inclusion. This has been successful due to the support of the Provost and the Deans. Each training is individually tailored to the corresponding discipline and uses the National Availability data through the Survey of Earned Doctorates. All tenure-track searches require a rubric that includes an area focused on diversity and inclusion. All job descriptions include a statement about the value of diversity. Some departments do ask for an additional statement on the value of diversity and the candidate’s commitment to this value; this could be useful to departments that do not centrally focus on diversity.

As a result of collaboration between HR and ODI, this Inclusive Search training process has now been expanded to include all staff hiring managers as of December 2016.

In addition, since late Spring 2016, ODI started to work with searches on job descriptions and formal recruitment plans at the start of the process. ODI is also working with HR on revising the venues used for the publicizing job postings. Depending on the search, ODI has been involved in meeting with candidates. As mentioned above, ODI also provides financial incentives to diversify finalist pools by helping to fund a fourth candidate's travel to campus if it adds diversity to the finalist pool.

FACULTY AND STAFF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

Under the area of Faculty and Staff Training and Development, the Blue Ribbon Commission issued the following recommendations:

- (32) Expand professional development opportunities aimed at promoting the success of faculty of color
- (33) Expand opportunities for training on culturally inclusive teaching
- (34) Provide training on culturally responsive academic advising

HIGH PRIORITY AREAS

The recommendations viewed as high priority by the Task Force in this area include:

- (32) Expand professional development opportunities aimed at promoting the success of faculty of color
- (33) Expand opportunities for training on culturally inclusive teaching

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

RECOMMENDATION #32: Professional Development

The BRC report affirmed that need to expand existing efforts to continue promoting the success of faculty of color.

The Task Force is in agreement with this recommendation. Below, we provide examples of strategies to operationalize it.

Faculty Development and ODI, which provide funding, should **continue to support participation in programming offered by the [National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity](#)**

[\(NCFDD\)](#), and particularly in its [Faculty Success Program](#) (FSP), which is designed to promote scholarly productivity and develop professional mentoring relationships and has produced successful outcomes among the 59 SCU faculty who have participated so far, including 29 faculty of color. Faculty Development offers participation in the FSP to all incoming tenure-stream faculty, and postdoctoral fellows. This will require a **greater allocation of resources to NCFDD**, as the number of faculty participating in the program has increased due to increased numbers of faculty hires and increased interest resulting from positive word-of-mouth. In addition, NCFDD has raised its membership rates, requiring a greater expense from SCU to continue to offer this resource, even at current levels.

Faculty Development and ODI should continue to **explore ways to build upon the model used by the Culture Power Difference (CPD) group to expand to other faculty and disciplines**. CPD is a group that provides a collaborative, interdisciplinary, and informal space for Santa Clara faculty to share and receive feedback on original research that broadly engages with issues of power, culture, and difference within the humanities and social sciences. The group's members, who are primarily pre-tenure, and either women or racial/ethnic minorities, provides a supportive intellectual community. This is similar to a faculty learning community, a model used by SCU's Faculty Collaborative on Teaching Innovation to support groups working together on teaching-related projects with similar interests and goals.

Faculty Development currently offers mentoring on an individual basis and in peer cohort groups to faculty members, consultation on teaching, and mentoring and advice on work-life issues. As we discussed in relation to BRC recommendation #6 (support for leaders), Faculty Development should **expand opportunities for more intentional mentoring opportunities not only at the pre-tenure stage but also post-tenure** to help Associate Professors make timely progress to the rank of Full Professor and to encourage and equip those who are interested and capable to prepare for leadership roles. This **may involve connecting faculty of color with mentors at SCU, or if necessary and appropriate, outside the university**.

The Office of the Provost, ODI, and the College of Arts & Sciences and/or other schools at SCU should **explore opportunities to enrich and expand the intellectual community of scholars conducting research on racial and ethnic justice issues through the use of faculty seminars**. One such possibility exists in the form of summer institutes (a successful model is the [Racial Democracy, Crime and Justice Network's Summer Research Institute](#)), which could be pursued by a consortium of Jesuit universities. Another model is a faculty research seminar operated during the regular academic session (such as [Rutgers University's Institute for Research on Women seminar](#)). This would not only promote faculty success in the short term, but support faculty retention through the construction of a supportive intellectual community centered around issues of diversity. In addition, the **Office of the Provost should expand funding for diversity-related research opportunities for faculty with relevant scholarly expertise**.

As we discussed in connection with BRC recommendation #20 (faculty rewards), the department, College/school, and University levels, **efforts should be made to ensure that faculty who engage in diversity and inclusion work (in the areas of research, teaching and service) are rewarded for doing so**; otherwise, the burden of "cultural taxation" can

disadvantage faculty who spend their time and energy on this service. This includes recognizing and rewarding the work of faculty of color who provide informal advising and support to students of color who are not formally assigned to them as advisees, as well as supporting faculty who engage in collaborative research as well as service and programming around diversity. **A model to consider could be something similar to the [efforts at UW-Eau Claire to link diversity and inclusion work to faculty and staff evaluations](#).** Currently, we do not consistently ask questions related to faculty diversity and inclusion work as part of the evaluation process.

More broadly, **faculty and staff should be asked during evaluation processes to link their work to the mission and values of SCU. Those who are evaluating faculty and staff should be made more aware of the importance of such contributions and the time and physical and emotional energy that go into diversity-related work. Evaluators (including rank and tenure committees) should be provided with materials/training to enhance their understanding of forms of bias that may be present in assessments of the quality of research and teaching by peers, students, external reviewers, etc., particularly for faculty of color and faculty teaching racially sensitive material.** The Deans and the Office of the Provost can lead these efforts.

The Task Force also recognizes that promoting the success of faculty also requires examining concerns related to retention and the barriers that may be impacting faculty success. In the consultation process, one key factor impacting faculty satisfaction was the high cost of living and the concerns relating to faculty housing, day care for children, and other dynamics of quality of life. While a broad range of faculty members faces these issues, black and Latina/o faculty, due to the racial wealth gap, may feel them more acutely.

As with other related recommendations, the Task Force notes that **similar forms of attention must be given to the retention and success of staff of color.** These efforts can be spearheaded by the Department of Human Resources.

RECOMMENDATION #33: Professional Development for Inclusive Teaching

The BRC report recommended the need for additional professional development opportunities for inclusive teaching and pedagogy. The Task Force is in agreement with this recommendation, which is related to BRC recommendation #19 (enhancement of diversity in the curriculum). More details can be found under #19 with a detailed description of the Task Force's recommendations on how to proceed.

One question that arose in consultations was how to address the phenomenon of “preaching to the choir.” In other words, when training on culturally inclusive teaching or other diversity topics is offered, the majority of voluntary participants are usually those who are already the most engaged in diversity work. It is more challenging to engage faculty members who have more to learn in this area, and it is nearly impossible to compel faculty to participate in any activities. One suggestion is to **create a faculty working group focusing on faculty training and development towards campus change**, to use the members of our faculty who are already have the pedagogical training and research expertise, and to come up with ideas for engaging a

broader audience on these matters. This could be facilitated by Faculty Development or the Faculty Collaborative on Teaching Innovation. **Deans should also engage department chairs in conversations on how to encourage participation in professional development.**

Faculty Development, in partnership with the Office for Diversity and Inclusion, used the 2016-17 VITAL series to focus on inclusive teaching and diversity in the classroom. A longstanding faculty discussion group, VITAL (Vitality in Teaching and Learning) offers an opportunity to gather with faculty peers across the disciplines to discuss readings about teaching. This is a good example of how **existing groups and structures can direct their focus to important themes such as racial and ethnic diversity and inclusion**, if even on a temporary basis. In prior years, Faculty CAFEs, lunchtime discussions hosted by the Faculty Collaborative on Teaching Innovation have focused on topics related to culturally inclusive teaching. Other **faculty groups that are already in place should consider a similar directed thematic focus for a given session, quarter, or year.**

Recently in June 2017, Dr. Karla Scott from St. Louis University was invited to our campus to offer workshops for administrative and student leaders on intergroup communication and engagement across differences and for faculty on inclusive teaching. Members of the Ethnic Studies Department provided consultation and facilitation to faculty participants as they worked on pedagogy, assignments, and course design. **More special events featuring guest speakers or facilitators with expertise in diversity and inclusion should be offered in the future. Such speakers should be paired with members of the faculty who have research training and pedagogical expertise when they visit the campus such as the faculty in Ethnic Studies and Women's and Gender Studies.** If necessary, **funding for these events can be provided collaboratively by multiple units on campus.**

OTHER PRIORITY AREAS

The recommendations viewed as other priority by the Task Force in this area include:

- (34) Provide training on culturally responsive academic advising

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

RECOMMENDATION #34: Academic Advising

The BRC provided feedback indicating that SCU should provide professional development opportunities for academic advisors to develop culturally responsive academic advising skills.

The Task Force is in agreement with the BRC regarding the need for additional training and support for those who provide academic advising for both undergraduate and graduate students.

The Drahmman Advising Center oversees advising efforts at SCU. While Drahmman offers one-

on-one training with faculty advisors as needed, there is no specific workshop or curriculum that addresses culturally responsive advising for faculty advisors campus-wide. Faculty are assigned to advise students through their departments. A student's individual faculty advisor is his or her primary resource for information and assistance on academic policy, curricular planning, and program choice. Students may also make appointments with a University Advisor in the Drahmman Center for supplemental assistance.

While all Tenured/Tenure Track faculty go through some advising training at the start of their formal employment, we suggest that advisor training include a section on culturally responsive advising for new faculty. Training should be made available for existing faculty who don't centrally deal with diversity and did not have the benefit of a diversity training when they were first hired. This would provide the opportunity for the Drahmman Center to **engage faculty advisors in culturally responsive advising approaches, for those departments and individuals who need such training**. Meanwhile, Faculty Development can work with the Drahmman Center to **develop and offer workshops on culturally responsive advising**.

Based on consultations with the Drahmman Advising center, we agree with their assessment that the **Deans and Provost need to meet to discuss the advising goals and strategies for the institution as a whole**. Advising is currently being done the same way teaching is - differently depending on each faculty member. If we want to be known as a campus where students get good advising from faculty, we need to train them properly. Advising is not intuitive for all faculty, and negative outcomes may arise if we refer students to faculty who are not properly prepared.

USE OF DATA AND EVIDENCE

Under the area of Use of Data and Evidence, the Blue Ribbon Commission issued the following recommendations:

- (35) Disaggregate institutional data for accurate analysis of persistence and graduation rates
- (36) Conduct continuous assessment to track progress toward creating a more diverse and inclusive campus
- (37) Publish annual reports on diversity and inclusion activity to continuously maintain transparency, monitor progress, and inform future efforts.

HIGH PRIORITY AREAS

All three of the recommendations in this area are viewed as high priority by the Task Force.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

RECOMMENDATION #35: Disaggregation of Institutional Data

The BRC report mentioned the need for the disaggregation of institutional data for accurate analysis. The Task Force agrees with this recommendation. Some of this disaggregation already occurs, but it needs to be expanded.

The Task Force agrees that **SCU needs better disaggregation of data on Asian and Pacific Islander (API) communities and should make changes to the collection of data in the “Hispanic” category to keep current with best practices in social science research.** In particular, the University complies with federal designations regarding “Hispanic” which treat the population as an ethnic group but not a racial category of its own. This practice identifies a large portion of the population as either “white” or “other.” The Task Force recommends additional data collection to separate non-Hispanic Whites from Hispanic individuals, and disaggregation of this category in a manner similar to our recommendation for API communities. This provides important and useful details while also permitting reaggregation if necessary for certain reporting requirements.

Groups such as **CIE and individual departments can also engage more closely with Institutional Research**, the office responsible for the integrity of the data used for federal and official reports, to discuss the types of data that they can provide to assist campus stakeholders. As a relevant example, Institutional Research, in partnership with the Office for Diversity and Inclusion, developed the Diversity dashboard as one way to make data available to the broader community. The dashboard is continuously updated based on the latest figures and based on needed requests. Currently, the diversity dashboard provides breakdowns on enrollment trends for undergraduate and graduate students, graduation rates, and information on full-time staff and full-time faculty.

RECOMMENDATION #36: Continuous Assessment

The BRC report emphasized the importance of research and assessment in helping to ensure that diversity and inclusion initiatives are informed by evidence as a way to ensure a focus on progress.

The Task Force views research and assessment as pivotal in ensuring ongoing accountability. The Task Force strongly endorses **moving forward as soon as possible with a Campus Climate Study** of students, faculty, and staff to enhance our current body of information on diversity and inclusion.

Current efforts related to this recommendation include the surveys conducted through the Office of Assessment and Institutional Research. While the surveys do not have a sole focus on diversity, each has questions that pertain to this area. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Survey for both

first-year students and graduating seniors have provided some valuable insight regarding demographic patterns. However, they lack a detailed picture of the attitudes and concerns of different stakeholders.

For a number of years, there has been discussion about the need and value of a broader Campus Climate Study. Following the release of the BRC report, the Office for Diversity and Inclusion, with support from the Office of the Provost, has been engaged in discussions with the Council on Inclusive Excellence and different national researchers on potential approaches. The Council has provided its consent to moving forward with a Campus Climate Study, and the President and Provost have agreed as well.

A Campus Climate Study would provide valuable information to better understand the attitudes and experiences of students, faculty, and staff related to issues of diversity and inclusion. These specific data should be used in conjunction with the volumes of student, staff, and faculty testimony that have been amassed in previous years and through units such as Ethnic Studies, Women's and Gender Studies, and the Multicultural Center. **SCU should establish a five-year cycle of ongoing campus climate studies** to monitor our institution's progress on its diversity and inclusion goals. Results from future studies will inform our ongoing assessment of diversity work.

Assessment of the Core Curriculum, which has begun this year through the Office of Assessment, should also be ongoing. **Core curriculum assessment should include more details such as comparison of outcomes for Core diversity courses offered by different departments. In addition, the core diversity committee should be empowered to use information from the assessments to recommend improvement or removal of low-achieving diversity courses.**

RECOMMENDATION #37: Annual Reports

The BRC Report highlighted the importance of publishing annual reports on the state of diversity at the university. The Task force agrees with this recommendation, and believes that the reports would also help to provide an additional level of accountability as well.

Currently, there is no formal annual report that encompasses and summarizes all of the diversity and inclusion efforts across campus, but rather a series of updates done by the different offices/units that work on these issues.

Moving forward, **the Council on Inclusive Excellence, which will be in charge of accountability for the BRC and Task Force recommendations, should devise a process for producing annual reports.**

CONCLUSION

The Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion has reviewed in detail the 37 recommendations submitted by the Blue Ribbon Commission on Diversity and Inclusion to SCU President Engh. Responding to the charge presented to us by the University Coordinating Committee, in this report we have prioritized these recommendations, along with a 38th recommendation added by the Task Force to ensure future accountability and ongoing implementation. Per our charge, and through an extensive process of discussions within the Task Force and consultations with stakeholders throughout the university, we have “fashion(ed) the strategic plan around concrete goals that can be advanced through specific initiatives and programs with measurable outcomes in the next five years.” These specific initiatives and programs are summarized in the table in the Appendix of this report. We wish to emphasize that while this list is long, many of the efforts that we recommend can be made concurrently by multiple stakeholders across campus.

“Increasing diversity, access, and affordability” is a fundamental pillar of SCU’s Strategic Plan. Not only is this goal important as we strive for continued institutional success in a rapidly-changing demographic environment, it is also integrally tied to SCU’s mission to provide a Jesuit, Catholic education to our students. However, without robust and continuous funding to support the implementation of the strategies contained in this report, we cannot make real, measurable, and sustained progress on our goals around diversity and inclusion. Therefore, the Task Force urges university leadership to prioritize funding for diversity and inclusion work in its budgeting and fundraising efforts.

We also wish to emphasize the need for ongoing, sustained, and collaborative efforts to work on the implementation of the strategies put forth in this report. Long-term commitment to assessment and reassessment of progress through regular reporting on progress within groups tasked with carrying out implementation efforts and among the broader SCU community through public reports and open forums will help to ensure transparency and accountability, as well as adjustments in our approaches to diversity and inclusion issues as new needs emerge and/or progress is made.

Our hope is that the recommendations contained in this report provide a useful blueprint from which immediate efforts can commence. It is not intended to be a comprehensive or final plan, but rather a foundation upon which substantial, visible, and sustained progress can be built.

APPENDIX

Table of Recommendations, Initiatives, and Programs

| AREA/Recommendation/Initiatives & Programs | Priority Level | Time Frame |
|--|----------------|---|
| LEADERSHIP | | |
| 1. Declare a visible commitment to diversity and inclusion | High | Short/medium term |
| 2. Communicate a clear vision for diversity and inclusion | High | Short/medium term |
| <i>2A. Communications about diversity and inclusion should emphasize the rationale and need for this work, its integral ties to our values as a Jesuit, Catholic institution, and the benefits that related efforts provide to our community as a whole.</i> | | Short term and ongoing |
| <i>2B. Clarify the departments, units, programs, and structures on campus that deal centrally and consistently with issues of diversity and inclusion among students, faculty, and staff.</i> | | Short/medium term |
| <i>2C. The university's central "Diversity" website should be organized to make it easier for users to find what they need based on issues, needs, groups, etc.</i> | | Short term and ongoing |
| <i>2D. Information about efforts and events related to diversity and inclusion across campus should be shared and continuously updated on both the general "Diversity" page and the specific web pages associated with individual units and departments.</i> | | Short/medium term and ongoing |
| 3. Integrate diversity and inclusion into language and communications | Medium | Medium term |
| <i>3A. Outlets such as Santa Clara Magazine, social media channels, press releases, and University web pages should clearly communicate that diversity and inclusion work is a high priority for the institution, connected to our core values.</i> | | Medium term |
| 4. Prioritize and maintain transparency about diversity and inclusion efforts | High - Medium | Short/medium term |
| <i>4A. This report should be shared with the SCU community.</i> | | Short term |
| <i>4B. Proactive communications should be made on at least a quarterly basis to share progress updates.</i> | | Short/medium term and ongoing |
| 5. Set goals to increase representational diversity of leadership | High | Starting immediately to affect long term change |

| | | |
|---|-------------|--|
| <i>5A. Proceed with intentionality with regard to racial and ethnic diversity as future searches and appointments are made.</i> | | Short term and continuing on an ongoing basis |
| <i>5B. Inclusive search training is already in place for tenure-track faculty and staff hires, most of the faculty searches have a diversity component in the rubric, and most do include a diversity-related question in the interview process. If these elements are not already present during all searches for executive level hires, they should be implemented.</i> | | Starting immediately with all new searches and ongoing |
| <i>5C. The Board of Trustees should be encouraged by the University leadership to engage in discussions regarding how they can increase their efforts to diversify their new membership.</i> | | Starting immediately to affect long term change |
| <i>5D. The Affirmative Action Plan should be made public to ensure transparency and accountability with regard to progress on the composition of our leadership.</i> | | Short term |
| 6. Proactively support faculty and student leaders | High | Medium term |
| <i>6A. More leadership development should be provided for faculty and staff of color to gain additional skills and experiences to move up within the organization.</i> | | Starting immediately with medium term change in mind |
| <i>6B. More mentoring and support should be provided to tenure-stream faculty of color, particularly mid-career faculty, to help them gain the ability to seek leadership roles.</i> | | Starting immediately to affect medium term change |
| <i>6C. Continue and expanded support for the development of academic communities devoted to the study of race, ethnicity and intersectional diversity.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>6D. Further discussion should take place within Student Life and other divisions about ways to better support students who make major commitments to advance diversity and inclusion.</i> | | Medium term |
| STRATEGIC PLANNING AND (RE)STRUCTURING | | |
| 7. Engage the larger campus community in the development of university diversity and inclusion strategic planning | High | Short/medium term |
| <i>7A. Conduct a full campus-wide environmental scan and gap analysis.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>7B. Make efforts to fill gaps identified by analysis.</i> | | Medium term |
| 8. Facilitate diversity and inclusion strategic planning in units across campus | High | Medium term |

| | | |
|---|-------------|--|
| <i>8A. We encourage schools, departments, and offices throughout campus to engage in assessments of their work on diversity and inclusion, to develop plans to ensure progress, and to emphasize the importance of this work and its centrality to SCU's mission and values to their faculty and staff.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>8B. As departments and offices conduct their program reviews, they should include a discussion of their efforts and plans (if any) related to diversity and inclusion. If such efforts and plans do not exist, they should be initiated.</i> | | Medium term as program reviews come up |
| <i>8C. Academic departments and offices should be encouraged to work on plans for both collective and individual participation in diversity and inclusion work.</i> | | Medium term |
| <i>8D. Leaders in units across campus should make efforts to incorporate participation in diversity and inclusion work into performance reviews and reward structures.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| 9. Finalize and clarify the diversity and inclusion leadership structure and role(s) | High | Medium term |
| <i>9A. Designate the Council on Inclusive Excellence as the body responsible for determining the most appropriate structure</i> | | Short term |
| <i>9B. Whoever leads ODI in its future form should have a formal seat on the President's cabinet.</i> | | Medium term |
| <i>9C. ODI should have a full-time leader along with a staff member to provide support.</i> | | Medium term |
| 10. Designate a group to conduct ongoing work on structure for diversity and inclusion | High | Short term |
| <i>10A. The structure for diversity and inclusion should be determined, carried out, and periodically reassessed by a more long-term group on campus.</i> | | Medium to long term |
| <i>10B. The Council on Inclusive Excellence (CIE) should be charged with the responsibility of examining all options and recommending a model for the structure of diversity and inclusion at SCU.</i> | | Starting in the next year; short term |
| <i>10C. CIE should conduct a university-wide audit with to determine all the offices and individuals who are currently tasked with diversity and inclusion work and compare their assigned roles with SCU's current diversity and inclusion needs.</i> | | Starting in the next year; short term |
| 11. Identify and commit resources to a budget for diversity and inclusion | High | Short/medium/long term |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p><i>11A. Complete (1) systematic institutional review and climate survey; (2) identification of gaps; (3) identification of corresponding needs; (4) decision about D&I structure at SCU; and (5) assessment of budget and resource needs based on the preceding steps.</i></p> | | <p>Starting in the next year and ongoing</p> |
| <p><i>11B. Action on these steps (in recommendation 11A) should not stall or halt current campus investments in diversity and inclusion where the work is already happening (e.g. in academic units or student centers and organizations) or where there are immediate steps recommended by the Task Force.</i></p> | | <p>Ongoing</p> |
| <p><i>11C. Diversity and inclusion should be considered a top priority as SCU transitions from the “quiet phase” of the current Capital Campaign, which focuses on a small number of priorities with an emphasis on capital projects, to the “public phase,” which will focus on a broader set of priorities identified in the Santa Clara 2020 Integrated Strategic Plan.</i></p> | | <p>Starting in the next year and ongoing through the current capital campaign</p> |
| <p><i>11D. Develop fundraising efforts for diversity through coordination and consultation between the Development Office and units currently engaged in diversity work.</i></p> | | <p>Starting in the next year and ongoing through the current capital campaign</p> |
| <p><i>11E. The University Budget Committee should make an effort to identify areas where some funds can be redirected to some of the short-term budget needs identified in this report.</i></p> | | <p>Short term start; ongoing through long term</p> |
| <p><i>11F. The University should reconsider the current incremental model of budgeting.</i></p> | | <p>Short to medium term</p> |
| <p><i>11G. University Relations, in collaboration with members of the Board of Trustees or Board of Regents, should identify and cultivate potential donors who are already engaged in giving that supports underserved communities.</i></p> | | <p>Starting immediately with medium to long term effects in mind</p> |
| <p><i>11H. University Relations, in collaboration with the Alumni Association, should engage alumni identity organizations, other alumni groups, and members of the current SCU community in fundraising campaigns to support endowed chairs that could be offered as part of target-of-opportunity hiring efforts.</i></p> | | <p>Medium to long term</p> |
| <p><i>11I. For the SCU Day of Giving, internal and external donors should be identified to offer challenge grants or matching dollars to encourage SCU community members and alumni to participate in targeted giving to support diversity and inclusion programs.</i></p> | | <p>Short term start; ongoing through long term</p> |
| <p><i>11J. The Development Office should work with the Deans, Faculty Development, Sponsored Projects, ODI, Ethnic Studies Department, Women’s and Gender Studies Department, Student Life, and other units on campus to identify and pursue</i></p> | | <p>Medium to long term</p> |

| | | |
|---|-------------|---|
| <i>grants from foundations, corporations, government, and other external sources to support diversity and inclusion research, training, programming, scholarships, and more. This might require an upfront commitment of internal resources to be matched by external funding.</i> | | |
| <i>11K. Funds that become available through Sustaining Excellence initiatives should be allocated to immediate budgetary needs associated with important strategic priorities such as diversity and inclusion.</i> | | Short term start; ongoing through long term as Sustaining Excellence savings are realized |
| <i>11L. SCU should also consider pooling resources with existing and future networks, to coordinate efforts around faculty and staff of color support and recruitment.</i> | | Medium to long term |
| STUDENT RECRUITMENT AND ADMISSIONS | | |
| 12. Designate a task force or working group on college access | High | Short term |
| <i>12A. Appropriate offices (including Undergraduate Admission, Financial Aid, and Development) need to discuss and determine the specific form of this group.</i> | | Short term |
| <i>12B. Any task force or working group that will work on college access for students of color needs to have access to fundraising channels.</i> | | Short term |
| <i>12C. Representatives from the offices responsible for Graduate Admissions should work together with Undergraduate Admission to share ideas and best practices for increasing diversity efforts with regard to recruitment, admissions, and financial aid, and where appropriate, coordinate their efforts.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>12D. Consider developing closer partnerships with other institutions working on issues of college access in the local area.</i> | | Medium to long term |
| 13. Set a long-term admissions and financial aid goal of need-blindness and meeting full need | High | Long term |
| <i>13A. Make more concerted fundraising efforts for scholarships and financial aid.</i> | | Short term; ongoing through the current capital campaign |
| <i>13B. SCU should leverage merit scholarships to bring in more economic and racial/ethnic diversity among our students.</i> | | Short to medium term |

| | | |
|---|---------------|---|
| <i>13C. The offices responsible for administering merit scholarships should make a greater effort to recruit students of color to apply for these opportunities, encourage students of color who have been identified as potential candidates to complete the application process, and review selection processes so that applicants of color are not eliminated from the selection process earlier than necessary.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>13D. Merit scholarships could be designated for students of color.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>13E. Applicants of color should be reminded, encouraged, and assisted as much as possible in the processes of completing the FAFSA and other paperwork.</i> | | Short term start; ongoing through long term |
| 14. Set measurable student representational diversity goals | High | No Consensus |
| <i>14A. Experts working in the area of admissions should be consulted for help in setting representational diversity goals.</i> | | Short term |
| <i>14B. State of California demographic data can be used as a potential guideline to measure campus diversity.</i> | | Short term to produce medium to long term effects |
| <i>14C. Continue to enhance and expand efforts to increase the percentage of African-American/Black students.</i> | | Short term to produce medium to long term effects |
| <i>14D. Make SCU eligible to apply for Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) status as a preliminary goal, but aspire in the longer-term to greater representation of Latina/o students, staff and faculty beyond those initial numbers.</i> | | Medium to long term |
| <i>14E. Disaggregate data on Asian American students and set corresponding goals to improve representation of underrepresented Asian and Pacific Islander subgroups.</i> | | Medium to long term |
| <i>14F. Enhance and expand efforts to increase the percentage of Native American/American Indian students.</i> | | Medium to long term |
| 15. Prioritize capacity to contribute to diversity and inclusion in the review of student admissions applications | Medium | Short term |
| <i>15A. Undergraduate Admission should review the effectiveness of the application evaluation process on a continuing basis, while considering best practices at other institutions.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>15B. Graduate Admissions offices at SCU should also consider adopting holistic review processes.</i> | | Short to medium term |

| | | |
|---|---------------|---|
| <i>15C. More entities on campus should get involved in efforts to improve the yield of students of color.</i> | | Starting immediately with medium term effects in mind |
| <i>15D. Any additional work to assist with student recruitment should be carefully coordinated, compensated, and voluntary for the faculty and staff of color and students.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>15E. Graduate Admissions offices should consider expanding targeted outreach efforts to increase the yield for admitted students of color.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| 16. Enhance the diversity and inclusion component of admissions and orientation programs | High | Already in process with room for improvement in the short to medium term |
| <i>16A. Continue to enhance and expand overnight programs for incoming students of color.</i> | | Short to medium term as funds become available |
| <i>16B. Provide travel funding for low-income students to ensure they have access to overnight programs, and providing translators who meet the needs of non-English speaking families.</i> | | Short to medium term as funds become available |
| 17. Evaluate and establish partnerships with pipeline programs to enhance recruitment efforts to diversify the student body | Medium | Medium term |
| <i>17A. Form a standing committee that includes various individuals who currently are engaged in working with pipeline programs.</i> | | Medium term |
| <i>17B. Identify and evaluate the effectiveness of current SCU pipeline programs.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>17C. Better articulate the value of pipeline programs and development of a plan for how SCU will handle applicants from these programs.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>17D. Standing committee should examine best practices and models for successful pipeline initiatives.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>17E. Develop and track results from future partnerships with outside organizations.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| 18. Establish and strengthen intentional partnerships with employers | Low | Medium term |
| <i>18A. Assign a staff member or team to take on the responsibility for engaging with diversity officers at various Silicon Valley companies and in the greater Bay Area.</i> | | Short to medium term |

| | | |
|--|--|----------------------|
| <i>18B. Programs could be developed to provide targeted career fairs, mentoring, internships, job shadowing opportunities, and informational interviews to underserved/underrepresented students from all majors.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>18C. Special attention should be afforded to establishing relationships that further career connections for students in the humanities and social science departments.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>18D. Once these relationships and programs are established, the coordinator(s) should be sure that they are well-publicized through Admissions and University Marketing and Communications.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>18E. Leverage existing relationships such as those that have already been cultivated by the Ignatian Center, the Miller Center, Leavey School of Business, Career Center, Alumni Association, and some student organizations such as the National Society of Black Engineers (NSBE), the Society of Hispanic Professional Engineers (SHPE), the Leavey Black Business Association, Latino Business Student Association, certain multicultural Greek organizations that have members who are SCU students, and others.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>18F. Programming on this topic could be coordinated with diversity offices at local companies.</i> | | Short to medium term |

CAMPUS SUPPORT SYSTEMS AND LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES

| | | |
|--|-------------|--|
| 19. Create a task force or working group to work on ways to improve our incorporation of diversity in the curriculum | High | Starting in short term for long term change |
| <i>19A. Develop a structure for faculty training to ensure that course content is appropriate and effective at accomplishing learning objectives related to diversity.</i> | | Medium term |
| <i>19B. Integrate diversity into ELSJ and C&I, or into additional Pathway courses.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>19C. Future assessment reports should include more information about where shortcomings in Diversity Core courses are centered.</i> | | Medium term |
| 20. Adopt policies to integrate inclusion into faculty rewards | High | Starting in short term for medium to long term change |
| <i>20A. Evaluate actual student knowledge about diversity with other forms of assessment such as a pre/post-test.</i> | | Short to medium term |

| | | |
|---|-------------|--|
| <i>20B. Provide training for department colleagues and Rank and Tenure committee members to understand and recognize issues of bias that might impact the evaluations of women's and faculty of color's dossiers and understanding of their contributions in research, teaching, and service.</i> | | Starting immediately and ongoing |
| <i>20C. Faculty who are seeking tenure and/or promotion should be encouraged to explain how their work at SCU engages with the commitment to diversity spelled out in the campus mission and values as well as its strategic plan.</i> | | Short term |
| <i>20D. Provide more intentional mentoring of women and faculty of color as they prepare for the promotion and tenure process.</i> | | Short term |
| <i>20E. Training can be introduced for staff members and those who conduct annual performance reviews and consider staff contributions for awards and other forms of recognition.</i> | | Short term |
| <i>20F. Properly compensate faculty and staff whose work is instrumental to promoting diversity at SCU.</i> | | Medium term |
| <i>20G. Other forms of recognition, particularly those that come with compensation in terms of money or time (e.g. faculty course releases), should be developed at all levels of the university for individuals who make substantial contributions to the university around diversity and inclusion.</i> | | Medium to long term as funds become available |
| 21. Create an inclusive first-year experience agenda | High | In process; continuing through long term |
| <i>21A. Prepare to sustain growth in LEAD in subsequent years by identifying and cultivating future funding sources.</i> | | Medium to long term |
| <i>21B. Create a more formal inventory of mentoring opportunities for students of color and potential gaps.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>21C. If "Being a Bronco" is adopted, sources of additional budget support should be identified and pursued to sustain the effort in subsequent years.</i> | | Short to medium term depending on decision about adoption |
| 22. Support the development and expansion of culturally relevant leadership opportunities | High | Starting in short term for medium to long term change |
| <i>22A. Take an inventory of leadership opportunities, and add new ideas to those that already exist.</i> | | Short term |
| <i>22B. Tie leadership opportunities to immediate or longer-term rewards for those who take them.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| 23. Host quarterly diversity and inclusion forums on campus | Low | Already in place |

| | | |
|--|---------------|--|
| <i>23A. Institutionalize on an ongoing basis the practice of holding quarterly open forums.</i> | | Already in place; continue on an ongoing basis |
| <i>23B. Future forums should engage key stakeholders as participants and planners while seeking opportunities to extend the conversation and include the entire campus.</i> | | Already in place; continue on an ongoing basis |
| 24. Designate a working group or task force on Greek Life to revisit the relationship between the university and Greek organizations | Medium | Medium term |
| <i>24A. There needs to be engagement with students involved in fraternities and sororities around their role in the climate of inclusion and exclusion among students at SCU, especially those living off-campus.</i> | | Medium term |
| 25. Develop a plan to enhance diverse alumni engagement | Medium | Medium term |
| <i>25A. Include stronger connections with academic programs and faculty; expand mentoring opportunities between alumni and students of color; and provide more visible and tangible support for the identity-based alumni groups.</i> | | Medium term |
| <i>25B. Create more opportunities to engage in inexpensive or free programs, which could increase participation among younger alumni of color.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>25C. Improve data sharing and integration across offices.</i> | | Medium term |
| <i>25D. Increase racial and ethnic diversity among the Alumni Association staff.</i> | | Medium to long term |
| <i>25E. Designate a full-time staff member solely to manage the identity-based groups.</i> | | Medium term |
| <i>25F. The Alumni Association should work with other groups on campus including University Relations/Development, certain academic departments, Undergraduate Admission, and others to explore opportunities to collaborate on fundraising efforts.</i> | | Medium term |
| <i>25G. Coordinate more between the Alumni Association and graduate alumni activities to work together around identity groups and international alumni.</i> | | Medium term |
| FACULTY RECRUITMENT AND HIRING | | |
| 26. Set faculty representational diversity goals | High | Short term |
| <i>26A. Tether faculty and staff representative diversity goals to key benchmarks.</i> | | Short term |

| | | |
|--|---------------|---|
| <i>26B. ODI should conduct more exploration of the points in the recruitment, interview, and hiring process at which candidates of color are being cut from the applicant pool.</i> | | Short term |
| <i>26C. Greater efforts should be made to understand the circumstances that have prompted untimely departures of several existing faculty of color and attendant investments made in retention of faculty of color.</i> | | Short term |
| <i>26D. Prioritize hiring people who are qualified and experienced in work with diverse communities.</i> | | Short term and ongoing |
| <i>26E. Participate in conferences offered through meetings of organizations that target graduate students and recent PhDs from underrepresented communities.</i> | | Medium term |
| 27. Maintain support for inclusive excellence postdoctoral fellowships | Medium | Short/medium term |
| <i>27A. Other schools in the University should consider adopting inclusive excellence postdoctoral fellowship programs.</i> | | Medium term as funds become available |
| <i>27B. Opportunities in CAS should be sustained or expanded.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>27C. Funding must be made available to support expansion of these opportunities.</i> | | Long term |
| <i>27D. Faculty colleagues who provide mentoring and other assistance to inclusive excellence postdocs in existing or new postdoc programs should continue to be recognized and rewarded for their efforts.</i> | | Already in place; include in future new opportunities |
| 28. Allocate funds to strategically hire scholars committed to diversity and inclusion | High | Long term |
| <i>28A. Hire faculty with relevant academic experiences and demonstrated commitment to diversity-related work.</i> | | Long term |
| <i>28B. Create opportunities for targeted hires to be made when outstanding candidates of color are identified to fulfill known departmental needs outside the regular hiring cycle.</i> | | Long term |
| <i>28C. Development and University Relations, with guidance from the Alumni Association, should initiate efforts to raise money for endowed professorships that can be used in the targeted recruitment of senior faculty members.</i> | | Medium to long term |
| <i>28D. Pursue ways to allocate or reserve funding to support targeted hires at the junior level.</i> | | Medium to long term |
| <i>28E. The need to increase diversity should also be discussed by</i> | | Short to medium term |

| | | |
|--|---------------|---|
| <i>departments in their Program Review processes.</i> | | |
| <i>28F. Schools/Colleges and departments should take advantage whenever possible to bring in faculty of color as Visiting Professors or Professors of Practice, or in similar higher-profile non-tenured faculty positions.</i> | | Medium to long term |
| 29. Explore ways to pool resources across units to support hiring clusters of scholars committed to diversity and inclusion | Medium | Medium/Long term |
| <i>29A. Hiring multiple faculty to create a critical mass of engaged faculty of color who can provide professional and personal peer support.</i> | | Medium to long term |
| <i>29B. Consider using Target of Opportunity (TOP) hires to bring experienced scholars to SCU who represent underrepresented groups and are committed to diversity.</i> | | Medium term |
| <i>29C. University needs to provide support for these types of hires (Target of Opportunity), clearly articulate when and how these opportunities exist for individual academic units, and facilitate consultation between Deans and the Office of the Provost to use these hires to meet known needs (e.g. as identified in Program Review) to enhance diversity.</i> | | Medium to long term |
| <i>29D. Task Force strongly recommends against the use of joint appointments to fulfill either TOP or cluster hiring.</i> | | Ongoing |
| <i>29E. SCU should also consider collaborating with other universities and colleges in our geographic region to pursue efforts such as support for “trailing partners” of faculty hires or even a regional form of cluster hiring.</i> | | Long term |
| 30. Be more aggressive in meaningfully integrating diversity into all aspects of professional search processes | Medium | Medium/long term |
| 31. Respond to the need for new Ethnic Studies faculty hires to ensure equitable faculty-to-student ratios across campus | High | Medium/long term |
| <i>31A. Make resources available to hire more faculty in the Department of Ethnic Studies.</i> | | Medium to long term as funds become available |
| <i>31B. Department of Women’s & Gender Studies, which faces similar issues, should also be prioritized in the allocation of faculty hiring lines.</i> | | Medium to long term as funds become available |
| <i>31C. Assess the volume of diversity work done within these units that goes beyond the typical faculty expectations.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| 32. Expand professional development opportunities aimed at promoting the success of faculty of color | High | Short/medium term |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <i>32A. Continue to support participation in programming offered by the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity (NCFDD).</i> | | Short term |
| <i>32B. Increase allocation of resources to NCFDD.</i> | | Short to medium term as funds become available |
| <i>32C. Explore ways to build upon the model used by the Culture Power Difference (CPD) group to expand to other faculty and disciplines.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>32D. Expand opportunities for more intentional mentoring opportunities not only at the pre-tenure stage but also post-tenure.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>32E. Connect faculty of color with mentors at SCU, or if necessary and appropriate, outside the university.</i> | | Short to medium term and ongoing |
| <i>32F. Explore opportunities such as summer institutes (a successful model is the Racial Democracy, Crime and Justice Network's Summer Research Institute), which could be pursued by a consortium of Jesuit universities, and related faculty research seminars.</i> | | Medium to long term |
| <i>32G. Office of the Provost should expand funding for diversity-related research opportunities for faculty with relevant scholarly expertise.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>32H. Efforts should be made to ensure that faculty who engage in diversity and inclusion work (in the areas of research, teaching and service) are rewarded for doing so</i> | | Medium term to long term |
| <i>32I. Consider a model similar to the efforts at UW-Eau Claire to link diversity and inclusion work to faculty and staff evaluations.</i> | | Medium term |
| <i>32J. Faculty and staff should be asked during evaluation processes to link their work to the mission and values of SCU. Those who are evaluating faculty and staff should be made more aware of the importance of such contributions and the time and physical and emotional energy that go into diversity-related work.</i> | | Short term and ongoing |
| <i>32K. Evaluators (including rank and tenure committees) should be provided with materials/training to enhance their understanding of forms of bias that may be present in assessments of the quality of research and teaching by peers, students, external reviewers, etc., particularly for faculty of color and faculty teaching racially sensitive material.</i> | | Short term and ongoing |

| | | |
|--|-------------|----------------------------------|
| <i>32L. Similar forms of attention must be given to the retention and success of staff of color.</i> | | Short to medium term and ongoing |
| 33. Expand opportunities for training on culturally inclusive teaching | High | Medium term |
| <i>33A. Create a faculty working group focusing on faculty training and development towards campus change.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>33B. Deans should also engage department chairs in conversations on how to encourage participation in professional development.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>33C. Existing groups and structures can direct their focus to important themes such as racial and ethnic diversity and inclusion.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>33D. Faculty groups that are already in place should consider a similar directed thematic focus for a given session, quarter, or year.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| <i>33E. More special events featuring guest speakers or facilitators with expertise in diversity and inclusion should be offered in the future. Such speakers should be paired with members of the faculty who have research training and pedagogical expertise when they visit the campus such as the faculty in Ethnic Studies and Women's and Gender Studies. If necessary, funding for these events can be provided collaboratively by multiple units on campus.</i> | | Short to medium term |
| 34. Provide training on culturally responsive academic advising | Low | Short term |
| <i>34A. Engage faculty advisors in culturally responsive advising approaches, for those departments and individuals who need such training.</i> | | Short to medium term and ongoing |
| <i>34B. Develop and offer workshops on culturally responsive advising.</i> | | Short to medium term and ongoing |
| <i>34C. Deans and Provost need to meet to discuss the advising goals and strategies for the institution as a whole.</i> | | Medium term |
| USE OF DATA AND EVIDENCE | | |
| 35. Disaggregate institutional data for accurate analysis of persistence and graduation rates | High | Medium term |
| <i>35A. SCU needs better disaggregation of data on Asian and Pacific Islander (API) communities and should make changes to the collection of data in the "Hispanic" category to keep current with best practices in social science research.</i> | | Medium term |

| | | |
|---|-------------|--|
| <i>35B. CIE and individual departments can also engage more closely with Institutional Research.</i> | | Medium term |
| 36. Conduct continuous assessment to track progress toward creating a more diverse and inclusive campus | High | Medium term |
| <i>36A. Move forward as soon as possible with a Campus Climate Study.</i> | | Short term |
| <i>36B. SCU should establish a five-year cycle of ongoing campus climate studies.</i> | | Medium to long term |
| <i>36C. Core curriculum assessment should include more details such as comparison of outcomes for Core diversity courses offered by different departments.</i> | | Medium term |
| <i>36D. The Core diversity committee should be empowered to use information from the assessments to recommend improvement or removal of low-achieving diversity courses.</i> | | Medium term |
| 37. Publish annual reports on diversity and inclusion activity to continuously maintain transparency, monitor progress, and inform future efforts | High | Short/medium term |
| <i>37A. The Council on Inclusive Excellence, which will be in charge of accountability for the BRC and Task Force recommendations, should devise a process for producing annual reports.</i> | | Short to medium term and ongoing |
| ACCOUNTABILITY AND FUTURE IMPLEMENTATION | | |
| 38. Establish a structure for future accountability and implementation of BRC recommendations | High | Short term with outcomes over medium to long term |
| <i>38A. Designate the Council on Inclusive Excellence (CIE) to serve as the body responsible for maintaining accountability and future progress, while the Office for Diversity and Inclusion monitors the implementation of the recommendations.</i> | | Short term |
| <i>38B. The Council on Inclusive Excellence (CIE) must be restructured to consist of the individuals who are directly engaged in intersectional racial and ethnic diversity and inclusion initiatives. Specifically, representatives from each of the following units, and in particular individuals who deal directly with issues of diversity and inclusion in these units, should be invited to serve on the Council for Inclusive Excellence: Office for Diversity and Inclusion, Student Life, Office for Multicultural Learning, Global Engagement Office, LEAD Scholars Program, Faculty Development, Undergraduate Admission, Human Resources, Title IX/Equal Employment Opportunity office, Department of Ethnic Studies, Department</i> | | Short term |

| | | |
|---|--|-------------------------------|
| <p><i>of Women’s and Gender Studies, Latina/o Faculty Group, Women of Color Network, Multicultural Center, Student Council on Inclusive Excellence, Campus Ministry.</i></p> | | |
| <p><i>38C. Form a separate advisory board associated with CIE that consists of administrative leaders at the Dean, Vice Provost, and Vice President and Cabinet levels, as well as individuals from offices such as University Relations and University Marketing and Communication, and other groups such as the Alumni Association.</i></p> | | <p>Short term</p> |
| <p><i>38D. This advisory board should meet with the CIE 2-3 times per year, while the CIE should meet monthly.</i></p> | | <p>Short term and ongoing</p> |