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Summary

Charged in February 2013 with examining the campus climate for diversity, the Presidential Commission on Diversity worked for a full calendar year towards the goal of creating a new strategic map that would locate diversity and inclusion at the core of the St. Lawrence experience.

Considering matters of class, gender, race/ethnicity/nationality, ability, age, religion, sexual orientation, and gender identity, among others, the Commission studied the variety of ways that the University must change not only to meet the demands of the current and future markets, but also to become a better and stronger institution through becoming more diverse.

Commission members conducted research, surveyed practices at other institutions and consulted with a variety of audiences, identifying strengths and potential for improvement in the following areas:

- Planning/Governance/Policy
- Staffing
- Facilities
- Student Recruitment and Retention
- Faculty/Staff Recruitment and Retention
- Curriculum/Co-Curriculum
- Programming/Training
- Public Relations/Publications/Advertising
- Alumni Engagement/Development Efforts
- Assessment

For each area, the report includes a number of Requirements (things that the University must do), Recommendations (things that the University should do) and Suggestions (things that it would be good for the University to do) to assist St. Lawrence in beginning a new, far-reaching conversation about diversity and inclusion.

It is the hope of the Commission that the initiatives spurred by that conversation will make St. Lawrence a model to which other institutions look for inspiration and guidance.
Introduction

In the Summer 2013 (Vol. 99, No. 3) edition of the American Association of Colleges and Universities' publication *Liberal Education*, an article by Spelman College Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Johnnella E. Butler, titled "Two Steps Forward, One Step Backward: Must This Be the Future of Diversity?" posits that diversity and inclusion are "wicked problems."

She explains that the term, coined in the late 1960s by social planners, refers to problems that resist solutions. Attempting to solve wicked problems leads to the discovery of other problems that were not known until solution of the original problem was attempted, and attempts at solutions also create new, additional problems.

That is why the work of diversity and inclusion in an organization is never truly concluded. It is an on-going initiative, requiring dedication, commitment and effort at all levels, across departments and disciplines, and throughout every sector of the community.

No examination of diversity, including this one, can ever be considered comprehensive enough to have addressed every issue confronting an institution. Even as the Requirements, Recommendations and Suggestions within this report are discussed, debated and enacted, additional issues must be expected to come to the fore.

Diversity and inclusion have particular importance at higher education institutions for two reasons. First, students seeking college degrees come from ever-more diverse backgrounds. Second, studies overwhelmingly indicate that critical thinking skills are enhanced when students "encounter diversity," meaning both coming into contact with students from backgrounds different from their own and taking courses dealing with diversity and inclusion topics. Those that benefit most, the studies show, are the traditional majority student population of St. Lawrence University, white students. Students from under-represented backgrounds benefit as well, as they prepare to live and work in environments different than those in which they grew up.

From the start it was agreed by the members of the Commission that while diversity goals on college campuses were once determined mostly by meeting race-based matriculation numbers, progress toward goals are now measured in the myriad ways we identify ourselves and the programming we provide to benefit from one another's worldviews.

These measurements of true diversity still include race, but now equally consider gender, sexuality, sexual orientation, gender identity and expression, socioeconomic status, geography, religion, physical and mental challenges, and more. In the new normal, successfully diverse colleges and universities do not merely improve enrollment ratios, but engage their populations in ways that promote excellent teaching and learning for everyone in the community.

With those ideals firmly in mind, members of the Commission quickly realized that merely planning to increase diversity is to fail at the outset, and that a concurrent inquiry into inclusion was needed; that if we were to succeed in our charge, the phrase all of us must use for all of our work is "diversity and inclusion." The Commission's examination of diversity and
inclusion did not arise out of a vacuum or after an acute issue on campus, but comes as the next logical step in fulfilling the goals of *The St. Lawrence Promise: A Strategic Map.*

The Universalist roots that mandated St. Lawrence University be coeducational from its founding continue to define Laurentians as being committed to the pursuit of equality for all. We now face a unique opportunity for the kind of change that does not require rebranding, but instead calls on us all to deepen our brand by moving together to create and sustain a truly inclusive community.

So, this examination of diversity and inclusion at St. Lawrence was not undertaken merely as an exercise, to see where we have been and where we are now, or to determine an arbitrary measurement of how we "stack up" compared to like institutions. It was given thought, consideration and study in order for us to find ways to become a better, stronger institution, one that produces graduates fully equipped not only to meet the challenges in our collective future, but to lead us through them.

---

**Charge**

In January of 2013, President Fox announced the appointment of a Presidential Commission on Diversity, to follow through on some of the goals contained in *The St. Lawrence Promise: A Strategic Map.* His announcement to the campus community stated:

No large or controversial incident on the St. Lawrence campus has prompted this desire to explore and map the territory of diversity at a liberal arts university. We are mindful, nevertheless, that in the last decade on campuses across America there have been disturbing episodes ranging from ignorant insensitivity to blatant bigotry, the subtle to the criminal, which could potentially occur anywhere. Rather, St. Lawrence has that rare, prevenient opportunity to "get ahead" of itself and others in order to think hard, plan wisely, and make adjustments within that learning "experimental station" that is a campus democratic society.

The Presidential Commission on Diversity at St. Lawrence will be expected to study carefully the history and current situation of the university's campus climate, measuring the many vital signs of diversity, whether strong or faint. Research questions will not be prescribed, but ought to include the following:

1. Why is St. Lawrence a good choice for students (or why not?) from previously underserved populations? How does St. Lawrence measure against its peers? Where are the best bridges in place? Where are the remaining gaps?

2. In addition to understanding the power and experience of race and color, are the discussions at St. Lawrence about faith, gender, sexuality, social class, and the issues of special needs, such as physical and mental challenges, more than mere acknowledgment of diversity taxonomy? What needs to be said or done in better and broader terms?
3. What are the prevailing and beneath-the-surface attitudes about diversity within the larger St. Lawrence community, particularly how they are different among the variety of constituents (e.g., does the world view of current students differ significantly from that of alumni)? What are the problematic perceptions among the stake-holders? Are the experiences of living on campus qualitatively better now than in the past? What's it like to live in the Canton community as a person of color working at St. Lawrence? What are the residual "soft" prejudices?

4. In examining our pedagogical tropes and strategies, are we teaching and advising students in ways that foster a more genuine, thorough, and complex understanding of the pluralistically mixed society they will navigate? As the philosopher John Hick used to say, if you know only one, then you know none, not even your own. How does a St. Lawrence education ensure against that self-limiting outcome?

5. What kinds of curricular activity are missing from the St. Lawrence program — either in essentials or desirables? How short do we fall in developing courses that view human, social, economic, historic, or environmental conditions in the widest possible pluralistic scope? While St. Lawrence will introduce new graduation requirements in the fall of 2013, including a general category of diversity (foreign language study will be one option to meet this criterion), where in our learning environment should thoughtful conversations about diversity, inclusivity, equity, and pluralism be located?

6. What is our reputation for recruiting students, faculty, and staff who are otherwise under-represented in our population? What goals and resources need to be identified, clarified, and implemented to make us better at recruiting and supporting individuals once they are on campus? Further, do our university communications and marketing properly reflect St. Lawrence's commitment to building a diverse community? Do our messages reach diverse audiences and adequately portray the campus experience?

7. How will the future alumni body expect to stay connected with St. Lawrence? What will it take to ensure that future? Will certain traditions help or hinder? What should the university expect in the challenge to sustain strong lines of loyalty?

8. Most importantly, as a liberal arts college, how will we study and teach with "liberality" the subject of living together? Or in the terms of a recent national inter-faith conference, of living "better together?"

Process

Members of the Commission gathered for a two-day Retreat at the beginning of February, 2013. Working with facilitator Carlos E. Cortés, professor emeritus of history at the University of California, Riverside, a noted authority on the implications of diversity for education, government, business and the mass media, we explored our personal experiences, the culture of St. Lawrence and our collective aspirations for the journey upon which we were to embark. Members agreed upon a number of topic areas to investigate and organized into committees:
• Steering Committee, including Chair Marion Roach Smith '77, Vice President and Dean of the University Val Lehr, Vice President and Dean of Student Life Joe Tolliver, Director of Institutional Research Christine Zimmerman (research coordinator) and Director of Employee Recruitment, Training & Affirmative Action Macreena Doyle (staff coordinator)

• Student Life 360, to take a view of the total student experience, including curriculum, co-curricular life, athletics, residence life and preparation for life beyond St. Lawrence

• SLU Culture, to examine the current climate for diversity and inclusion at the University

• Recruitment and Retention, encompassing efforts involving students, faculty and staff

• Outreach, for exploration of our public relations; messaging; relationships with alumni, parents and prospective students; and our relationship with our community neighbors

In some cases, the areas explored by the committees overlapped, which was purposeful, to lessen the possibility that important topics would "fall through the cracks."

As membership of the Commission included alumni and trustees who are not regularly on campus, methods for sharing information and materials, and for communicating regularly, were established, including conference calling, Skype, a Sakai-based website and an email listserv.

Following the February Retreat, committees conducted research that was shared, and regular meetings commenced.

A second two-day Retreat was held on campus in June, 2013, to agree upon desired outcomes, a planned timeline and methods for proceeding in the work of the Commission. Prior to the Retreat, a common text was chosen, the American Association of Colleges and Universities publication *Making a Real Difference with Diversity: A Guide to Institutional Change* (Alma R. Clayton-Pedersen, Sharon Parker, Daryl G. Smith, José F. Moreno & Daniel Hiroyuki Teraguchi; Nancy O'Neill, contributing editor). A facilitated discussion of the dynamics of diversity and inclusion in higher education took place with J. W. Wiley, director of the Center for Diversity, Pluralism and Inclusion and a lecturer in philosophy and Interdisciplinary Studies at SUNY Plattsburgh.

The third full meeting of the Commission took place on campus in October, 2013, to agree upon final plans for producing this report. More detailed information about each of the committees' missions, structure and processes is contained in the sections of this report pertaining to their work.
I. Findings: Where We Are

Diversity and inclusivity are deeply rooted in St. Lawrence's founding as a co-educational Universalist theological school and college in 1856. A compilation of the letters and thoughts of J. M. Atwood, dean of the Canton Theological School of St. Lawrence University from 1914 to 1951, entitled "The Tao of Universalism," lays out some of the fundamental ideologies and educational goals that still shape the college today. Diversity, multiculturalism and inclusion were at the center of the school's educational mission.

Atwood wrote, "[The educational ideal] seeks to be universal in its scope. No class or race or sex or individual is to be favored or privileged. But all are to be included. Here, as elsewhere in a true democracy, each is to count one and no more than one."

It is with these principles that we were founded, with these in mind that we have provided diversity planning and programs, and with a firm belief in these that we must now move forward.

Student Life 360 Committee Report on Where We Are

Any findings on the current state of diversity and inclusion at St. Lawrence University must include the recognition that these are not new topics or areas of focus, and that there are many diversity-oriented programs on campus. These are principally sponsored by Student Life, International Education and Religious and Spiritual Life.

While there have been positions dedicated to furthering the University's diversity and inclusion goals in the past, and there was at one time a dedicated space on campus to provide a focus for related programming, the University has not to date invested its resources in the ways that some comparable institutions have, such as Colgate University's Office of Equality & Diversity, Hamilton College's Day-Massolo Center and Skidmore College's Office of Student Diversity Programs.

Views of the diversity climate on campus are mixed, but it appears that St. Lawrence has not created a sufficiently supportive infrastructure to make the campus the welcoming environment it needs to be. The spot approach of the past has not had the desired impact and will likely not be sufficient in the future to realize our goals.

First-Year Programming

There is a pervasive perspective on campus that while the academic process is important to students learning about diversity and inclusion, its practice and the development of deep diversity acumen will most effectively occur in peer-to-peer engagement with other students, experiencing other cultures and being exposed to people with a variety of perspectives.

The First-Year Program (FYP) presents critical example of where this need can be addressed. From 2007-2012 St. Lawrence University engaged in a study funded by a Teagle Grant which, in part, focused on topics including diversity and interactions across difference at St. Lawrence. In response to data which consistently indicated that St. Lawrence students of
color felt especially isolated within their FYP colleges, the Teagle committee recommended to the Associate Dean of the First Year that, beginning in fall 2011, students of color be "clustered" in FYP colleges. Although it is too early to determine with certainty, initial assessment data indicates that the new clustering model has alleviated feelings of isolation among students of color in their FYP colleges. Additionally, the clustering model has benefitted white students. According to the "Your First College Year" (YFCY) survey, white students in clustered FYP colleges report more cross-racial interactions than white students in FYP colleges with two or fewer students of color. The success of the clustering model reinforces the national research findings which demonstrate the benefit of diverse learning environments to both white and non-white students. The FYP should act as the gateway to intercultural competence for St. Lawrence students.

International Study

St. Lawrence University's openness to other cultures led to the establishment of its first study abroad program, France, in 1965, soon to be followed by programs in Austria (1969), Spain (1969), Kenya (1974) and London (1979). Currently, St. Lawrence offers programs in 18 countries and five locations within the U.S.

The University's Strategic Map identifies as a "key objective" the need to "continue to increase off-campus learning opportunities and better market them to current and prospective students." The Recession Response Phase II Report in 2011 recommended "targeted increases in off-campus study to balance the on-campus demands of overall University enrollment increases."

The participation rate in semester off-campus study for the graduating class of 2013 was 51%. An additional 10% participated in a short-term study-abroad experience. In the most recent Institute of International Education "Open Doors" report, St. Lawrence ranks #18 among U.S. four-year colleges for semester-long study abroad.

While applications for programs of study abroad have reached record-high numbers, due to budget limitations, the number of spots in our programs has not increased. The acceptance rate for study abroad for spring 2014 was 79%, compared to our typical rate of about 85%. The wait list includes many sophomores, who will be able to reapply as juniors, and those on the wait list are offered the option of a tuition-free summer international course if they do not choose to reapply in the fall. This is commendable, but it highlights an area of concern.

Issues for Students of Color/LGBTQ Students

Focus groups with LGBTQ students and students of color were conducted in fall 2013. Many of these students stressed the discomfort that they have felt in their FYP colleges from being one of only a few students of color/LGBTQ in their cohort or in their residence halls. A significant emphasis was noted on the perceived lack of visibility for LGBTQ resources on campus. Of particular concern to the students interviewed was the University website, seen by some to symbolize the lack of visibility and accessibility of resources and physical spaces for LGBTQ students on campus. One resource limitation that was highlighted was the need to include counseling services for transgender students. The lack of physical facilities is also
notable in the paucity of gender-neutral bathrooms on campus, a common accommodation at comparable institutions.

**Student Activities**

The University, through the Thelomathesian Society, sponsors a variety of cultural, ethnic, sexual orientation and other student identity groups, clubs and organizations.

Cultural and ethnic clubs and organizations provide a space for students to connect with people who might share similar experiences or cultural values, engage in dialogue about current issues, socialize, plan events, and learn from each other. All organizations are open to anyone. The following is a current list of groups that are clearly in this category, though it does not include spiritual/religious groups and/or all internationally focused groups.

**Advocates Program**
**African Student Union**
**Arabic Club**
**Asian Students Intercultural Association**
**Black Student Union**
**Canadian Students Affinity Group**
**Canton Ambassadors**
**Caribbean Students Club**
**Chinese Culture Club**
**Francophone Union**
**Intercultural Floor**
**Interesting Talks at SLU**
**Islamic Culture Club**
**Japanese Student Union**
**La Sociedad Hispana**
**La Casa Latina**
**La Tertulia Spanish Club**
**Pink Triangle**
**LGBT etc.**
**United World College Alums**
**Women's Resource Center**

Despite this inclusive list, questions of bridging as well as bonding remain, though what does seem clear is that while options exist for students to become engaged in activities with diversity and inclusion themes, there do not appear to be sufficient opportunities for those groups to work together and across divides.

**International Students**

International House or I-House (created in 1984), is a theme floor in Sykes Residence Hall for international students and any other students who are interested in different cultures. It's a mix of international and domestic students, and everything in between. Weekly tea times are a
long-standing tradition and open to everyone. Different student groups and organizations can and do host tea times, which broadens the scope of students who attend. The I-House kitchen and lounge is a space that is primarily student-run and occupied, and provides a social setting that is all their own. I-House has also become preferred housing for those who want a quiet and respectful place to live. Interestingly, it typically does not experience the type of damage or destruction seen in some other campus residences. It also hosts programming throughout the year including cookouts, holiday celebrations, and cultural performances.

Outside of I-House, many of the international students are heavily involved in clubs which host some of the biggest cultural events on campus. A.S.I.A. hosts Diwali, Holi, and Asia Night; Islamic Culture Club hosts Eid; the Chinese Culture Club hosts an Autumn Festival and Spring Festival. ASU hosts Africa week along with many other events throughout the year. Literacy for Nepal and Children of Guyana and Crafts for a Cause raise funds and awareness of world issues. It was primarily international students who hosted the recent Nelson Mandela celebration and there is now an international committee on Thelmo, MUN, and other groups that promote diversity, difference and cultural understanding. Our international students get involved in International Education Week and World Languages Week; they serve as language tutors and conversation partners. All activities hosted by international students are open to the entire campus, and advertised as such.

Greek Organizations

There are two fraternities and four sororities currently on campus. In 2013, 8% of undergraduate men had joined one of the two fraternities and 18% of undergraduate women had joined one of the four sorority chapters now active. Sorority membership has remained relatively steady in the past five years; membership in fraternities has increased slightly because one of the two fraternities was re-colonized during that time. A breakdown in the compositional diversity of the Greek system membership appears later in this report.

Religious and Spiritual Life

The Office of Religious and Spiritual Life at Gunnison Memorial Chapel at St. Lawrence University is a center of diverse cultural and religious learning and expression, spiritual development, hospitality and community engagement. Its aim is to increase student knowledge and engagement with intersections of religion and world affairs and to provide support and guidance to students as they wrestle with questions of meaning, faith, identity and purpose.

Through the University's chaplains, St. Lawrence offers a significant variety of programs in religious life and community service that are designed to extend both the curricular and co-curricular missions of the University outside the classroom. These programs seek to promote student inquiry, self-development/maturation, religious learning, spiritual growth, interfaith cooperation and service to the University community, the Canton community, and the wider world.

Currently, approximately one dozen student religious and/or social justice and student fellowship organizations cultivate interfaith understanding and cooperation. Further, the
University has Spiritual Advisors for a number of religious and spiritual denominations: Atheist, Buddhist, Christian Science, Earth-Based, Hindu, InterVarsity Christian Fellowship, Jewish, Mormon, Muslim, Progressive Christian, Quaker, and Roman Catholic. In addition, BYOB – Build Your Own Beliefs – is a program for anyone who feels ready to investigate their own spirituality.

Two statements by students interviewed indicate a reaction to the diverse nature of religious/spirituality activities offered at the University. One, remarking on the number of individual perspectives of God and spirituality at St. Lawrence said, "I never knew God was so big." A second, discussing the number of individual identities and the number of individual religious philosophies said, "Hands down, the 4 p.m. hour on Sunday at the Chapel Service is the most diverse place on campus."

**Athletics**

In spring 2013, the Athletics Department participated in a diversity workshop sponsored by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and conducted by the consulting firm David Hall Associates. Its final report stated:

"Based on our initial campus visit and engagement with the student athletes and staff, it is clear that St. Lawrence University is actively engaged in addressing diversity and inclusion on campus. The coaching staff of Athletic Department is clearly taking a leadership role in ensuring that the sports teams are safe and supportive environment for all students, regardless of their identities or backgrounds. This proactive approach is consistent with best practices in the field and is commendable. Continued efforts to build awareness, knowledge and skills have the strong potential to have a profound impact on the campus community.

"Overall, conversations with the coaching staff, SAC members, and student athletes indicate a strong need for ongoing education, training, and strategic planning related to diversity and inclusion, both within the athletics department and on the campus overall. If training efforts are continued and expanded, the resulting increased level of knowledge, comfort, and skill will directly benefit the campus community, and expedite the university goals of creating a safer, more inclusive, and accepting campus community. In turn, this will help increase student athletic and academic success, contribute to a more vibrant campus community, and further position St. Lawrence as an exemplary liberal arts college that prepares students for a complex and changing world."

A particular need cited by the consultant was "stronger efforts toward increased awareness and acceptance of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender students."

**SLU Culture Committee Report on Where We Are**

To understand who we are, and where we exist on our own timeline toward diversity and inclusion, we need to look at the current compositional makeup of the St. Lawrence University community.
The following information and statistics examine the compositional diversity of the University over the past 20 years, with some exceptions where data are not collected. For example, we have no statistics on LGBTQ status. The availability of data on student race/ethnicity information begins reliably in 1989. The alumni database includes more records, yet does not include foreign citizenship status, so which alumni were international students at the time of their enrollment is not known. The employee database includes visa status, but does not track citizenship status, which could illustrate the multiculturalism and internationalism of some of the now naturalized employees.

St. Lawrence Undergraduate Student Body, Fall 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Undergraduates</th>
<th>2400</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender Breakout</td>
<td>55% F/45% M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students of Color</td>
<td>12% (n=282)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Students</td>
<td>8% (n=182)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Country Students</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation Students</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell Grant Recipients</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Special Needs</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of Diversity Statistics, Entering First-Year Students, Fall 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent admitted</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering First-Year Class</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Pell Grants Female</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Minority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Aliens</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The NCG is St. Lawrence's comparison group of 25 private liberal arts colleges. Carnegie Peers are 266 baccalaureate liberal arts colleges with Title IV Funding; the most recently released public data available is from 2011.
Specific recruitment efforts and increased retention have nearly doubled SLU’s U.S. and international diversity over the past decade. In the fall of 2013, 68 of 186 undergraduate international students are Canadian citizens, 44 students come from China, and the remaining 74 students represent 48 additional nationalities.

Select Diversity Indicators for Greek Organizations vs. Independent Students, Fall 2013
Since 2000, racial/ethnic diversity has nearly doubled among student athletes.

Faculty and Staff Racial and Gender Diversity, Full Time 1997-2013

*TT = Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty
While the administration has historically been gender-balanced, the faculty of the 1990s was still predominantly male. Due to a large number of retirements and additional faculty hires in the late 1990s/early 2000s, the faculty has become gender-balanced overall, although some departmental/disciplinary differences still remain.

With respect to racial/ethnic diversity, trends for faculty and staff have followed different patterns, although both employment pools typically involve national searches: Faculty racial/ethnic diversity increased from a low of 5% to a high of 17% in 2006/2007 and has since slightly declined again to 15%. Staff racial/ethnic diversity increased from a low of 5% in 1997 to a high of 8% in 2004 and has since dropped to 4%.

### Composition of Full-Time Faculty, Fall 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Women n</th>
<th>Women in %</th>
<th>Of Color n</th>
<th>Of Color in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FT Faculty, Tenure-Track or Tenured</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors and Instructors</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT Faculty, Visiting</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Composition of Full-Time Administrative Staff, by Division, Fall 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Women n</th>
<th>Women in %</th>
<th>Of Color n</th>
<th>Of Color in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FT Administrative Staff, Total</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President and Senior Staff</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs Division</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions &amp; Financial Aid Division</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement Division</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Division (incl. NPR)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Operations Division</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Division</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR/Presidents Office</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries and IT Division</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Life Division</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Composition of Full-Time Non-Exempt Staff, by Job Category, Fall 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FT Hourly Staff, Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Women n</th>
<th>in %</th>
<th>Of Color n</th>
<th>in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clerical, Secretarial</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical, Paraprofessional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Trades</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service, Maintenance</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Research and Surveys

The SLU Culture Committee reviewed multi-year survey findings from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Incoming Freshman Survey; the "Your First College Year" (YFCY) survey conducted at the end of the spring semester with first-year students in 2013; and Senior Survey findings from the Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium (HEDS) and Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) (multiple years). In addition, four focus groups were held, with a total of 35 students, representing CAs, LGBTQ students, students of color, and Chinese students.

For faculty issues, results from the HERI Faculty Surveys from 1998/99 through 2010/11 were analyzed and focus groups were held with tenured, tenure-track, visiting and adjunct faculty.

In addition, five focus groups engaged exempt and non-exempt staff. Finally, seven faculty and staff members whose positions either currently or in the past included working with diverse populations, were interviewed about their perceptions of climate and support for diversity, focusing on policies and support mechanisms for students, faculty, and staff.

Following is the narrative derived from those assessments.

Students

The majority of St. Lawrence students – non-minority as well as minority students – come to the University with little exposure to racial/ethnic diversity. (Survey findings are limited to these diversities.) According to CIRP 2010 data, 88% of all white students came from high schools that were mostly or entirely white, and 94% grew up in neighborhoods that were mostly or entirely white. Thirty-two percent of U.S. minority students came from non-white high schools and 50% grew up in completely/mostly non-white neighborhood. Fewer than 60% have socialized "frequently" with a racial/ethnic group different from their own in high school, compared to the national norm of 70%. Five percent (which equates in terms of our incoming class to an entire FYP college of 32 students) indicated not having socialized with someone of another racial/ethnic group at all.

After matriculation, responses to being a member of the St. Lawrence community vary widely. For instance, some students of color and self-identified LGBTQ students reported in
their focus groups that they found the culture at St. Lawrence to be unsupportive and unwelcoming, leading to feelings of isolation, ostracism, and invisibility. Further, several students of color stated that they had never felt stereotyped until they came to campus and described being left out of social activities in the FYP and athletic teams; having their viewpoints ignored in dance groups and other activities; being sexually objectified even when dressed similarly to other students; being ostracized for their hair-care practices; being presumed to be here solely because of color and expected to be "grateful"; and even hearing direct racial epithets and other overt insults.

Along with their responses to campus life, reactions on how to address campus diversity needs varied widely among students. When asked, students did not universally express enthusiasm for a physical "center" for diversity, though several participants in the LGBTQ focus group supported the idea, feeling it would provide a safe place for them to seek information and feel welcomed. One student expressed the specific concern that it not be simply "window dressing," but instead be an active resource providing services to LGBTQ students and to educate the community. At least one student was concerned that students might avoid such a center for fear of being perceived as LGBTQ, which could create a ghettoizing effect. LGBTQ participants were unanimously enthusiastic about a full-time position dealing with diversity issues. Participants in the students of color focus group were more uniformly skeptical of a diversity "center," being concerned about its potential stigmatization as a "welfare center" (which we have subsequently learned is how some students refer to the Whitman Annex, the current location for student services). These students expressed concern over how the location and building type of any future site may exacerbate negative perceptions of its marginality and that of the students it serves.

St. Lawrence University policies, structures, and services are perceived by some as insufficiently supportive of LGBTQ students, ranging from housing/athletics/bathroom issues, to inadequate counseling services, to a lack of Orientation programming, to issues with organizational funding, to lack of a web presence and a visible space, such as a diversity center or LGBTQ office.

Despite survey results from CIRP indicating that students have become far more supportive of gay rights (e.g. 90% of the students entering in 2012 agreed that "same-sex couples should have the right to legal marital status"), two out of our three student focus groups clearly indicated that LGBTQ students face serious challenges in their interactions with peers. LGBTQ students indicated that the absence of any programming or information related to LGBTQ issues during Orientation contributed to feelings of isolation and invisibility. LGBTQ students indicated that the University's website was not helpful to them for finding relevant information.

The experiences of a transgender student suggest that the University in general (including housing and student registration policies), and the counseling program in particular, has limitations when working with issues faced by transgendered persons.

Students of color reported feeling isolated and ostracized in the FYP (with the exception of an FYP college that had five students of color). Racial tensions appear to be lower now than
they were during the 1980s and 1990s on campus and compared to students at other private colleges, St. Lawrence students report fewer negative interracial interactions.

International students, in particular students from China, face challenges with language barriers and differences in culture (YFCY survey). In addition, students who are in the majority in their home countries report that they are challenged to find they are now considered an under-represented group. International students praise faculty relationships and administrative support, but report finding it difficult to navigate St. Lawrence's social life as first-year students. Mean satisfaction ratings from the Spring 2013 First-Year Survey for "Social Life" compared as follows: 3.1 (overall), 2.8 for students from China, 2.6 for other not North-American students, 3.2 for North Country students.

The University has a wide variety of small multicultural groups (clubs, organizations, theme houses), but they reportedly operate as "isolated bubbles" that do not intersect and are not connected to a larger organizational structure; hence, they have not infused student culture.

While perhaps more subtle, social class issues were brought up in almost every focus group we conducted. The YFCY survey did not indicate that Pell Grant students experienced the campus climate differently from other students; graduation rates of Pell Grant recipients are at par as well. (The federal Pell Grant Program provides need-based grants to low-income undergraduate and certain post-baccalaureate students to promote access to postsecondary education.)

Students reported dissatisfaction with the process through which student organizations are funded. For a recent stretch of three years, the SLUSAF treasurer, the only non-elected position, was a member of the Beta Theta Pi fraternity, resulting in a perception that funds were distributed with bias. A recent appointment broke that trend.

Faculty/Staff

Almost every faculty/staff member interviewed reported a perception that the campus diversity climate has declined over the past decade. One reason, stated frequently, is a perceived lack of an unbiased channel for the resolution of possibly discriminatory interpersonal conflicts.

These findings are consistent with a trend analysis of responses to the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Faculty Survey (data available on a three-year cycle for 2008-09 through 2010-11). HERI data suggests that perceptions of how welcoming St. Lawrence is differ between white faculty and faculty of color. Specifically, while survey responses from white faculty show perceptions of improvements (e.g., regarding the University providing "a welcoming, comfortable environment for faculty of color," faculty of color being "treated fairly here," and campus discussions about critical or controversial issues being "generally respectful"), responses of faculty of color have steadily declined since 2001-02. In addition, faculty of color cite instances of "subtle discrimination," "colleagues," "institutional procedures," and "red tape" as sources of stress. Satisfaction with teaching load, professional relationships with other faculty, prospects for career advancement, and opportunities for scholarly pursuits are areas where ratings are significantly lower for faculty of color than for other faculty. Data show a steady
decline in ratings for faculty of color over the past decade, while they remained steady or improved for other faculty. In 2010-11, 89% of faculty of color said they considered leaving this institution for another in the past two years – compared to 44% of other faculty.

Faculty and staff were unclear about policies and procedures for addressing grievances and other concerns, with some suggesting that the University consider appointment of an ombudsperson operating independent of other campus judicial and adjudicatory channels, to keep confidentiality and assure a completely objective process. Added to this, some concern was expressed about diversity efforts failing without adequate funding and a clear charge. Interviews conveyed the impression that our past efforts (whether multicultural affairs director positions or the caucus of faculty of color) failed for those reasons.

While faculty and staff feel progress has been made in gender equity, particularly in hiring, concern was expressed that search committees are no longer sufficiently trained or educated about methods for developing diverse pools. Recently, efforts have been made by the Dean's office to provide some training for faculty searches, but this has not yet been expanded to staff searches. Given the relative campus scarcity of faculty of color, there is also concern that those here are disproportionally asked to serve on campus committees, leading to them having less time for research and other scholarly pursuits.

On the topic of our curriculum, faculty and staff interviewed expressed the belief that it does not adequately address diversity topics, particularly in the First-Year Program. Courses with a diversity component tend to draw students who are already interested in the topic; there is concern that the new diversity requirement may not be sufficient to reach all students.

As with the student findings, issues pertaining to class, while admittedly hard to measure, were heard in our discussions. For instance, faculty and staff interviews included mention that although there is some representation on tri-partite committees, some groups, notably administrators and hourly employees, have no role in University governance. This has led to the perception that it is a class issue. Improved communication, including monthly updates from the President, have given these groups greater access to information about decisions, but there are relatively few channels for open two-way communication.

Recruitment & Retention Committee Report on Where We Are

Trends, policies and practices related to recruiting and retaining faculty, staff and students, were researched, focusing on diversity and inclusion initiatives from a variety of institutions. Time and money were invested in a web series produced by an institution whose diversity efforts have proved successful in sustaining diversity work since implementing a host of policies and practices. In addition, St. Lawrence's past diversity efforts were examined, with the conclusion that those efforts were not well institutionalized. Therefore, attempts were made to research what gaps existed, in order to make recommendations for improvements, as well as create/edit/modify current policies and procedures.

With the exception of the curriculum, the University has not centralized efforts at improving diversity, which has led to periodic reinventing of the wheel. It is likely that this
pattern has resulted, at least in part, from a failure to adequately define specific long- and short-term goals, along with the means to achieve those goals and assessment of progress.

The perception persists that faculty and staff of color have left the University because of concerns about finding community here, but whether this is factual is not clear. A webinar produced by Academic Impressions and the AAC&U monograph *Making a Real Difference with Diversity* highlight the role that a Chief Diversity and Inclusion Officer (CDIO) and a center for inclusion and diversity can have in demonstrating institutional commitment to diversity and inclusion, and offer the conclusion that while support may be provided by individual offices or departments, if it is not coordinated, it is likely to be inconsistent.

The administration of diversity and inclusion programs takes a variety of forms on American college and university campuses. Skidmore College, for example, provides a horizontal leadership structure, placing responsibility in three offices: academic affairs, student life, and Equal Opportunity/administration. Oberlin College offers a Multicultural Resource Center (MRC), staffed by an associate dean/director, four community coordinators, and an administrative assistant. Many individuals within varied offices at St. Lawrence think about diversity in recruitment and retention, but their earnest efforts may be limited by other responsibilities and the fact that diversity promotion is not identified as a primary part of their mission or portfolio.

**Students**

The most recent available (2011) data for New Comparison Group (NCG) was compared to St. Lawrence's 2011 and 2013 metrics with specific concentration on means and medians. The analysis follows.

**U.S. Students of Color**

In 2011, U.S. students of color on our campus represented 10.7% of the student population, which is 0.8% above the minimum for our NCG comparison group of 9.8%. At that time, the average percent of U.S. students of color as a percent of the student body for our comparison group was 17.6%. Over the last two years, St. Lawrence has seen improvement, to 11.8% of total student body in 2013.

St. Lawrence has done well in attracting Native American students to its graduate programs, due in part to offering classes on site in the Akwesasne Mohawk community, beginning in 1976. The question remains if St. Lawrence can leverage its experience at the graduate level into raising the number of Native American undergraduate students.

The Pre-Collegiate Opportunity Program (PCOP), which existed for about a decade in the late 1990s through early 2000s, paired St. Lawrence students and faculty with partnership high schools in New York State that had large populations of under-represented students, including Salmon River Central School, which enrolls a substantial number of Native American students. The program began with grant funding, but did not continue when that support ended.
Partnership programs could benefit the University's recruitment efforts, particularly with schools serving under-represented students, and should be explored.

**International Students**

St. Lawrence has made significant progress in increasing the number of international students on campus over the last two years. In 2011, St. Lawrence was fairly close to the average for the NCG comparison group (5.7% international students at St. Lawrence vs. 5.3% for the comparison group). In 2013, the University had 7.8% international students as a percent of the total student body. However, this achievement has resulted in less diversity among international students; Chinese students went from 4.3% of all non-Canadian international students to 37.3%.

A central dimension of our international recruitment is the relationship St. Lawrence University has with the Davis United World College Scholars Program (UWC). Begun in 2000 by philanthropists Gale and Shelby M.C. Davis, the program is committed to building cross-cultural understanding throughout the world. St. Lawrence joined the program in 2004 and has enrolled 67 UWC students to date, a low number compared to other participants. These students bring specific strengths to our campus, including:

- **Academic rigor**: All UWC schools offer the International Baccalaureate (IB) curriculum, considered one of the most rigorous programs in high school curriculums around the world. It is important to note that the language of instruction at UWC schools is English and that applicants go through an intensive selection process for admission to a UWC. Only the most academically capable and socially committed students are admitted.

- **Involvement**: In addition to being excellent students in the classroom, the UWC students bring a demonstrated commitment to social concerns that resonates with the ideals of the St. Lawrence community. Upon entrance to college, these students have spent two years in a residential community that places strong value on international and intercultural understanding; the celebration of difference; personal responsibility and integrity; and mutual responsibility and respect. Coming out of this tradition, UWC students tend to be involved in community service projects, environmental initiatives, and social justice and global awareness organizations, to name a few.

- **Diversity**: There are currently 13 UWC schools worldwide. The majority of UWC campuses host over 40 different nationalities from around the globe.

- **Financial resources**: St. Lawrence's agreement with UWC is to commit to meeting 100 percent of the demonstrated need of any matriculated UWC student, while UWC remits the University $10,000 per student, per year. If the University enrolls a minimum of 40 total UWC students (across four classes of students), this amount will increase to $20,000 per student, per year.
Religious Diversity

Union College administers The Campus Religious and Spiritual Climate Survey and the chaplain there recommends it as a baseline for designing and assessing interfaith initiatives on campus. It has become clear that St. Lawrence would benefit from a deeper and more nuanced understanding of how our students understand a variety of issues related to diversity, including interfaith issues. This would provide useful data as we move forward with specific programs and policies designed to provide students with the basic skills necessary to engage, understand, and analyze religious components of relationships from the personal to the global.

On our own campus, plans are under way for adding an introductory course on world religions to the curriculum. This will provide an option for students interested in learning about religions, while also fostering cross-tradition conversation, both within and outside of class. It will also build connections between students and the larger community.

Students With Disabilities

According to an internal assessment administered by the Disability and Accessibility Services staff in spring 2013, roughly 72% (of 81 students responding to the question) of students with disabilities who participated found faculty to be "very helpful" in making accommodations based on their particular needs. The feedback from focus groups also suggests an overall supportive environment for students with "invisible" disabilities. However, on a larger scale, St. Lawrence lacks physical access needed for people with physical disabilities or impairments. There are several spaces on campus that call for attention, including theme houses, academic and administrative buildings.

While we meet the letter of the Americans with Disabilities Act throughout campus, there is a sense that we could do better on some of these issues. Currently, there is a proposal for revision of our service animal policy by the Safety and Security Committee. This proposal has been tabled until further notice. The staff of Disability and Accessibility Services feels strongly that these policies need review before a situation arises. Ideally, the University should provide an environment of independence and autonomy, with equitable access to the St. Lawrence experience for all students.

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Students

For three out of the past four years, St. Lawrence has been represented either by admissions staff or a student at the Campus Pride College Fair in New York City, an event for students who identify as LGBTQ. Participation should continue, as should a process to continually identify other events/surveys that could enhance our campus and signal that we provide a welcoming environment. Myriad sources now exist online that both rate campus resources and provide listings of upcoming LGBTQ college admission fairs, including the Campus Pride Index (http://www.campusprideindex.org/).

Responses from the focus group with LGBTQ students suggested that although we have two well-functioning student groups, we should investigate additional initiatives. For instance,
we have at times had a faculty/staff LGBTQ group that met with students to provide support and to bring students together.

Faculty and Staff

The Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs and Vice President/Dean of Academic Affairs began meeting with search chairs for tenure-track positions to discuss diversity in 2012. Because there was little evidence that the single meeting was effective, they also participated in a training session on recruiting and hiring faculty of color conducted by the New York Six consortium in fall 2013. Other participants, particularly Skidmore, have had success following the training sessions; in 2011, Skidmore performed 10 tenure track searches and hired 3 U.S. faculty of color.

Our representatives spoke with Skidmore Associate Dean for Personnel, Development, and Diversity Paty Rubio, Skidmore Dean of the Faculty/VP for Academic Affairs Beau Breslin, and University of Massachusetts Amherst Director of Workplace Learning and Development Linda Marchesani, who has been a consultant to Skidmore. During our discussions, these observations were offered:

- Skidmore has defined diversity as an institutional priority, allowing them to state this in advertisements ("The College is especially interested in candidates who can contribute to the diversity and excellence of the academic community through their research, teaching, and/or service.")
- Skidmore moved from doing a single workshop to a series of four "just in time" workshops. These provide information at key moments, suggest the seriousness of the process, and build a sense of community responsibility.
- The workshops are attended by Breslin and Rubio, but led by an outside consultant (Marchesani, who is also now working with Hamilton College).
- A diversity representative serves on all search committees.
- With diversity an institutional priority, departments understand that if they do not generate pools and long/short lists that do not reflect the diversity available in a field/subfield, the search could be ended without a hire.

As a result, materials from the workshop, as well as what was used last year, were used by the St. Lawrence dean and associate dean to put together the two workshops held on campus this year. The dean's office needs to determine if workshops held this year have an impact and consider whether we would benefit from an external consultant, as well as one or two additional workshops, next year.

With the advent of a new online application system (People Admin), expected to begin in February 2014, the University will be better able to track diversity data and use it in the search process. The ease of applicants' providing voluntary demographic information at the time of application will net more information about the diversity of candidate pools.

Although we currently lack data from LGBTQ faculty, future HERI faculty surveys will include a question about LBGT identification, providing us with additional data to analyze.
Outreach Committee Report on Where We Are

The Outreach Committee engaged in a broad observation that included an extensive review of development, public relations, marketing and admissions programs, and our relationship with our various communities, as well as the demographics of the St. Lawrence Board of Trustees and our Alumni Council. Data including the report resulting from the 2007-2012 St. Lawrence University Teagle Grant, Developing a Process Model for Systematically Assessing and Improving Liberal Education: the St Lawrence University Diversity Requirement Case Study was reviewed, with focus on topics including diversity and interactions across difference at St. Lawrence. Also analyzed were survey data from the College Success Questionnaire, Higher Educational Data Sharing Consortium (HEDS), Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) first-year and senior surveys and the Global Perspective Indicator. These tools provided critical information regarding the numbers of students of color, their history in choosing St Lawrence, and their levels of satisfaction at the University. Recent National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) data also shed considerable light on the types of interactions that occur across race and ethnicity on our campus. Two focus groups were conducted, one with scholarship students and one with Greek/theme house residents. A discussion with the Alumni Executive Council was held, during that group's annual Retreat, to learn more about how their experiences at St. Lawrence prepared them for living and working in a diverse world.

As a result of this research, a consensus view was reached that while the University understands the need to increase the number of administrative, staff, faculty and student positions filled by under-represented groups, and desires to do so, it cannot currently achieve these goals. Along with significant financial resources to accomplish these goals, the University is also lacking language in its guiding documents, specific policies, and mechanisms for much-needed bridging between existing programs, and in some cases, though fewer than expected, the data to achieve needed change.

It is the consensus view that truly engaging in diversity and inclusion requires an enormous shift of perspective that repositions goals from filling positions and classroom seats with people whose presence would grant us a certain satisfaction of numbers, to embracing the philosophy that a diverse and inclusive community results in excellent learning. St. Lawrence currently falls somewhere on this continuum of change, and that it is from a place of understanding the requirements for our success that St. Lawrence must make its next moves.

It is also the consensus view that our community as a whole does not fully reflect the idea that diversity is not static, but fluid. When examining this topic, the diversity of diversity itself must be acknowledged: contemporary families present many models. While some populations are recognized as "emerging," in fact, they have always been here, though they almost certainly have been under-served. That being the case, hard work should immediately proceed to shed any and every reflection of the belief that diversity is solely a race-based ideal, metric or goal, and replace those with the understanding that it encompasses gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual preference, economic status, race, age, religious and cultural heritage, geographic homelands, and a range of physical and mental abilities. The St. Lawrence
community should also consider that some of those categories may, at times, be fluid and provide for those times as well. Mixed-race, transgendered and those questioning their own sexuality need to receive the same considerations as others, so that they, too, will feel that they can be Laurentians for life.

This process toward true inclusion will present myriad issues as to how we represent ourselves on various platforms. For instance, while many aspects of diversity and inclusion can be represented in print and online materials through photo selection, the color of a person's skin does not adequately tell the tale of homeland culture and what that person brings to our campus. Similarly, it can be challenging to portray sexual identity accurately and without stereotype.

As stated earlier, the committee discussed the University's image as it is portrayed through our Board of Trustees and Alumni Executive Council membership demographics. Those conclusions appear later in this report, in the section entitled "Goals: Where We Want to Be."

Particular emphasis was given to our neighboring communities, including the status of our Akwesasne Mohawk neighbors and the inconsistent success we have had in our connections to them. Current records show nearly 100 St. Lawrence alumni who live within the Akwesasne nation, while it is likely hundreds more have left the region. Beginning the late 1960s, St. Lawrence faculty taught both undergraduate and graduate courses there, but commitment to continuing those efforts has remained largely through the efforts of individuals, rather than the University. Graduate courses continue to be taught on site.

The idea of centralizing the administration of diversity was debated in the committee, including what it would mean for our message. Following an extensive review of structures and programs at other colleges and universities, we favored those models that would provide St. Lawrence with a comprehensive, signature program that incorporates best practices, engenders building of alliances and perpetuates the "brand" of equality that was included in our founding.

Among the models considered was Earlham College's Diversity Progress Committee, which monitors progress on diversity goals and plans. Populated predominantly by members of senior staff, and including the head of student government and a faculty representative, the committee meets at least once each semester, provides annual reviews of the entire college and its progress toward diversity and inclusion goals, and is required to conduct an audit once every five years of vision statements; make strategic progress reports itemizing those "systemic problems that emerge or persist"; and make note of "the need for new directions."

Further, the Juniata Stewards of Diversity program, whose purpose is to populate every search committee with a member of the campus community trained in diversity recruitment was impressive, and sends a strong message of inclusion. Currently consisting of 22 stewards in all, the program is designed to "assist members in their search, selection and retention of qualified candidates." This program is designed to be regularly reviewed, and dismantled when no longer necessary.

A further example of the need for embedded cultural change that does not require a building or a designated position pertains to the prevailing and enduring sense of chagrin about
our location. Where this attitude exists, it does so in stark contrast to our publications and website, and to the views of those students who choose to come here. This alternate attitude – which carried in it the true understanding of how the unique character of the North Country provides its own diversity – was a hallmark of student interviews, and was perhaps best expressed by a United World College student who, when asked about the value of the North Country in his St. Lawrence education, said excitedly, "I got to room with someone from Vermont. That's diversity for me."

II. Goals: Where We Want To Be

Two threads of St. Lawrence's fabric provide the perfect model for what we are trying to accomplish: our Universalist roots and our approach to sustainability. Sustainability infuses every corner of the University's culture, yet there is no one position with full responsibility for making it a priority. There is no one structure to house the many aspects of our sustainability program, because they cannot be contained – they are spread throughout our curriculum, our co-curricular programs, our administrative functions and our daily lives in residence hall rooms, offices, dining facilities, study spaces and athletic fields. St. Lawrence has received national acclaim for its sustainability initiatives and we have the potential to obtain it with a strategic map for diversity and inclusion.

Achieving true diversity and inclusion at St Lawrence University requires change. These changes begin with language, without which we can neither plan nor measure what we set out to do. Scrutiny, assessment and rewrites on everything from our Mission Statement to Residential Life policies, from job postings to tweets, Reunion brochures, fund-raising letters, admissions materials, student organization event announcements, the athletics mission statement, and curricular offerings must highlight the embedded, cultural and longtime importance of diversity and inclusion in the history, planning and future of St. Lawrence University.

This cannot be an exercise in merely "talking the talk," nor is this to be mistaken for mere window dressing, for it is the firm, unified and informed belief of everyone on the Presidential Commission for Diversity that lacking the embedded language of diversity and inclusion we will forever lack the tools needed to plan, measure and assess our progress. In a word, lacking the language to both plan and then regularly assess how we are doing, we will fail.

If language edits, additions and emendations are small changes that have a big impact – and they are – also necessary are medium-level and large-scale changes that will require more time and broader discussion.

The Common Application provides a perfect example of a change that is easy and quick, and perhaps best illustrates a small step up from language changes. The Common Application allows institutions to personalize the application for its purposes. While the parameters of such personalization are narrow, they are a significant way for a college to correctly market its brand and culture to potential students.

Colleges and universities may choose certain tools to include on their application, including, though not limited to, a drop-down menu that allows potential students to check off
which co-curricular activities in which they might engage when enrolled. The menu serves not only as a way for the University to get to know applicants; it is also an opportunity to market St. Lawrence's programs. The range of co-curricular activities can include obvious items such as sports and student government, but may also include LGBTQ activities and ethnic student associations. While we have the latter activities on campus, we have not yet exercised the option of including them in the drop-down menu in the Common Application supplement, thereby missing an opportunity to demonstrate the University's commitment to those issues.

A 2011 piece in the publication *Diverse* revealed a landmark moment in diversity identity when they reported that Elmhurst College, a small liberal arts school in the Chicago suburbs, was the first in the nation to start asking students about sexual orientation, and was pushing the College Board to include the question on the Common Application.1 Today, gay students admitted to Elmhurst are eligible for a diversity grant equal to one-third the cost of attendance. A pioneer on this issue, Elmhurst has received enormous attention for its efforts, including a 2013 *New York Times* piece which characterizes schools such as MIT and the University of Iowa as "joining Elmhurst College," by adding questions about sexual orientation to their undergraduate applications.2 A small change, a big result and a real step forward for human rights. That is where we want to be.

Another obvious example of needed change, and one with financial impact, is the Presidential Diversity Scholar (PDS) program. To be eligible for a PDS, applicants must be a) students of any race who have demonstrated commitment to and appreciation for racial and ethnic diversity, or b) students of African-American, Asian-American, Hispanic American or Native American heritage on the basis of leadership and service to community. To apply, students are required to write an essay describing "how your experience will contribute to diversity at St. Lawrence University." Despite this explicit solicitation, at this time there is no existing programming for these scholars once they reach campus. The University will aid each of these scholars at a rate of $32,000 per year (in the Class of 2017), knowing the positive education and programming that these students might provide to their peers, but we do not ask or demand that they provide those benefits to our community.

Requiring the PDS to actively participate in promoting and advancing diversity and inclusion efforts during their four years at St. Lawrence is necessary. Further, just as the McNair Scholars (a federal program to increase the attainment of the Ph.D. by students from under-represented groups), have faculty and staff mentors during their time at St. Lawrence, linking PDS students with mentors who can help guide them in planning their campus involvement and with whom they would collaborate on assessing their efforts would provide a model for linking upper-class PDS to serve as peer-to-peer mentors for first-year students. This would be particularly effective with students from under-represented groups on campus, helping them to transition to college life (accessing resources, facilitating contacts with others on campus, etc.)


and engaging in conversations about multiculturalism and inclusion with their mentees (and others on campus) that, over time, should become part of the fabric of St. Lawrence student interactions.

Planning/Governance/Policy

It is the unified belief of Commission members that the University must incorporate the language of diversity and inclusion in its Mission Statement, as well as its other guiding documents. It is also the belief of the Commission members that this cannot be enacted in a vacuum, but rather, as part of a well-developed vision that includes the insertion of diversity and inclusion-specific desired outcomes into both our Strategic Map and our financial planning.

To achieve this, we must begin at the top levels of University governance.

It has been 40 years since the Presidential Commission on Coeducation, whose report, *Toward Positive Coeducation*, laid out 127 recommendations that were prescribed to enable gender equality on our campus and in our community, and while true gender equality requires the kind of vigilance and avidity we have come to take as a source of pride at St. Lawrence, it remains unachieved at the University Board level. While women have been part of our student body since our inception – we enrolled our first female student, Olympia Brown, in 1866 – and have been members of the Board since 1898, they have represented from as little as 6% to a high of 39% (2013-2014) of active or emeriti members. According to existing records on Board history (which may be incomplete, particularly for the University's earlier years), 138 people have been members, of which 37 have been women. No woman has served as chair and only four women have served as vice chair.

For St. Lawrence University to achieve true diversity and inclusion, the University's Board must engage in the same thorough audit of its culture that is being asked of the campus and community at large, making every effort to determine what, if any, cultural changes need to be implemented to encourage and support a woman becoming its chair.

Similarly, the Board makeup in the other indices of diversity reveals the need for thorough self-examination. Seven individuals of color have served on the Board in its history, including four during 2013-2014, and while current records do not provide reliable information about other attributes of diversity such as religion, physical ability, sexual orientation, or socioeconomic status, getting where we need to be requires nothing less than the dedicated attention of the Board to who we really are in this world. This must involve a hyper-local look at our own neighbors, including, though not limited to, the Akwesasne Mohawk population, for possible inclusion on the Board of Trustees.

For St. Lawrence University to sustain this newly energized effort for diversity and inclusion, all involved must engage in continued orientation, training and assessment, including the Board, and a system of regular progress reports to the Board from the community must be put in place.
Staffing

Staffing models for diversity and inclusion on American college campuses vary widely, including the length of time that some campuses have been providing services. Consider, for instance, that the Tennessee College of Engineering has had an Office of Diversity Programming in place on campus for 40 years. Schools have tried numerous models, and after reviewing those among our true peers, the one thing that became evident is that no one model fits us all.

Each committee of the Commission wrestled separately with the question of whether or not to recommend that the University create the position of a Chief Diversity and Inclusion Officer (CDIO) and/or establish a center or an Office for Diversity and Inclusion (OFDI) on campus. The Steering Committee, too, widely debated and discussed this model of administration.

Those who favor the administrative/CDIO model envision it as a full-time position dedicated to diversity and inclusion with responsibility for coordinating overall diversity activities; bringing best practices to campus; chairing an annual cross-functional assessment committee; and serving as a resource to both Senior Staff and the campus as a whole. Suggestions from those who favored this model foresee the position being highly visible, supported with adequate funding and assisted with an advisory committee whose members could include (but not be limited to) representation from hourly staff, Thelmo, Athletics, CIIS, Student Life, Facilities Operations, Diversity and Accessibility Services, FYP, Admissions, Dining Services, Chaplain's Office, Faculty Council, and Human Resources.

All involved agree that were such an officer and office to be created, they would serve as locus for coordination of diversity efforts on campus; for support of these efforts and information-sharing among constituencies; for gap analysis, creating efficiencies and eliminating the duplication of effort; for enlisting and engaging offices, individuals, and groups around campus in this work; and for community-building and recognition of success. Also agreed is that to be successful the center can't be the only location where diversity efforts happen on campus – and to which others can default – but rather the place in which these efforts are sparked, supported, coordinated, reinforced, and affirmed. Further, it was agreed that to be optimized these structures must be embedded within multiple, larger support systems across the campus, including sufficient budget and staffing and strong, formal relationships with standing committees and other groups that will implement day-to-day diversity efforts.

Alternate views to this model are based on the belief that fully embedding diversity and inclusion in the culture of St. Lawrence University is possible without a CDIO and OFDI, and that ample models for success are fully and successfully functioning on a variety of campuses.

Of particular interest to those who were not in favor of the CDIO officer and an OFDI was the immediate formation of a task force, reporting to the president and including members of

http://chronicle.com/article/A-Diversity-Effort-That-Goes/142553/
Senior Staff, as well as the president of Thelmo and a representative from the faculty, along the lines of the Diversity Progress Committee model used at Earlham, whose charge reads:

The Diversity Progress Committee (DPC) is responsible for monitoring our progress on the diversity goals and plans, which were outlined in the report of the Diversity Aspiration Group in December 2001, as subsequently approved by the Faculty Meeting, Board of Trustees, and Student Government. In doing so, the DPC should maintain communications with and solicit reports from those groups, offices, and committees identified in the plan as having responsibilities for the particular elements of the plan. In early autumn each year, the DPC should submit a report to the President and the Faculty reporting progress made during the past academic year, identifying items for the coming year's agenda and naming continuing challenges. This annual report should be developed with input from and in consultation with the Faculty Affairs Committee, Curricular Policy Committee, Committee on Campus Life, and the Admissions and Financial Aid Committee. At least every five years, the DPC should oversee a review of the vision statement and the plan and make a strategic report on progress, systemic problems that emerge or persist, and needs for new directions. As appropriate, the DPC should bring to the whole community suggestions for revisiting the vision statement and plan. The committee should meet at least once each semester.

Extensive debate took place about how to attain and maintain inclusion as an institutional value. Consensus was reached that achieving this goal could not be the sole province of one person or one office, nor could it be directed solely from one centralized building. Instead, what was heard, witnessed and recorded characterized our task as being a collaborative effort that is as dependent on myriad small changes as it is on large changes; that the immediate and practical amendments can take place even while discussion of solutions with a greater impact upon resources is under way.

Along the way, numerous ideas were discussed about how to immediately create accountability for keeping commitments to diversity and inclusion. One model that provided both language and structure was Vanderbilt University's Divinity School, in which a statement entitled "Living the Commitments," written jointly by students and faculty, is read, studied and written about as part of the orientation process, and whose principles and administration is the purview of a dean. Among the dean's responsibilities is to quickly respond to complaints filed about aspects of diversity rights infringements.

Other programs built for quick and informed responses include one at the University of Colorado, Boulder, resulting from discussions and recommendations presented by the Chancellor's Civility Task Force in 1998. Post-commission, they launched the Building Community Campaign, whose first major activity was the development of a "statement of commitment to community," which was read by a student government leader to all entering first-year students, who then, following Convocation, were asked to sign the pledge.

4 http://divinity.vanderbilt.edu/about/purposes.php

5 http://www.colorado.edu/odece/about/reports/cche00.html
The University of Maryland's Strategic Plan for Diversity includes funding for projects to advance the plan's goals, as well as a communications campaign called "Rise Above." Its website brings together the various aspects of diversity and inclusion at the institution, including hiring, curriculum and student recruitment.

These programs appear to contain the kind of responsive enterprise that allows for immediately addressing the "wicked problems" that we must learn to invite as we actively seek to become more diverse and inclusive.

Ultimately, it was agreed that to get where we need to go, a number of changes can be implemented immediately, simultaneous to a broad discussion taking place about whether to go with the administrative/CIDO model or a more grassroots model.

Facilities

St. Lawrence University has very successful programs that serve historically under-represented groups in the academy and the professions. These programs include the Higher Education Opportunity Program (HEOP), McNair Scholars, the Collegiate Science and Technology Entry Program (C-STEP), and the Disability and Accessibility Services office.

These programs and offices perform key roles in serving under-represented constituents. The University needs to make the physical spaces in which they are housed more visible as well as accessible to the central campus in a measure commensurate to their importance.

Just as the Center for International and Intercultural Studies is a central part of campus tours for prospective students and their parents, these programs and offices should also be a central recruitment feature for the University. The understanding at the time of placement of student services in the Whitman Annex was that this was temporary housing. The continued placement and utilization of that makeshift building sends a message to the community that we can no longer afford to sustain. To get where we need to go as a community, the relocation of those services would signal to those staffing the offices and students utilizing those services that we regard them as central to our diversity and inclusion mission.

Further, while it is not recommended that we recruit a particular number of students with physical disabilities or impairments, it is critical that the University welcome these particular students to campus in a way that creates independence and autonomy throughout the entire campus experience. The University should conduct a physical accessibility audit and consider making necessary changes to existing public spaces in order to provide physical access to those who need it (i.e. Braille alternatives in the dining hall or made-to-order stations, closed-captioning on public TVs, etc.), both for long- and short-term accommodation.

http://www.diversity.umd.edu/
Student Recruitment and Retention

Changing demographics worldwide have affected and continue to affect everything we do. By the year 2020, 45% of the nation's high school graduates will be what are now considered "minority" students, though that very word and the populations it represents is changing not only rapidly, but state by state, presenting remarkable challenges to college recruiting. For instance, the numbers of Hispanic youth are exceeding those of black students in several states, and recently became the dominant population in colleges, with more than 2.5 million enrolled.

The University must be agile enough to respond to changing demographics, but secure enough in its identity to resist responding, in knee-jerk fashion, to mere trends. Admissions recruiting tactics come and go and we must remain informed of those that have been tested and survived elsewhere with real results. It is not the intent to encourage St. Lawrence to become a market leader in creating admissions programs, but to continue to follow established best practices and regularly assess the market offerings. The current range of programming for increasing diversity in admissions includes, but are in no way limited to, what is known as a "posse" of similarly diverse applicants; "pipeline programs" that channel high school students toward specific schools and programs specifically targeting first-generation students, created in response to that growing demographic.

To enhance recruitment and retention of members of the LGBTQ community, the University should consider reviving the former faculty/staff LGBTQ group that met with students to provide support and to bring students together. Inviting LBGTQ alumni to give lectures, provide career networking and participate in other types of engagement could be explored, through visits to campus, or through the use of technology, such as recent Skype events. It is also possible that the alumnus-endowed annual lecture focusing on LGBTQ issues could be given greater prominence as a community development event, particularly if it was held early in the academic year. Greater emphasis on LGBTQ issues must also be part of Orientation events. Further, we support the recommendation by David Hall Associates that athletics do more diversity training focused on LGBTQ issues.

As stated earlier in this report, the ongoing chagrin about our location and about the North Country does not serve us, particularly because the North Country is a major piece of our


10 [http://www.pacific.edu/Campus-Life/Diversity-and-Inclusion/University-Pipeline-Programs.html](http://www.pacific.edu/Campus-Life/Diversity-and-Inclusion/University-Pipeline-Programs.html)

diversity offerings to many of our students. Plainly put, the North Country, which offers its own history, music, architecture, geography, demographics and more, is a draw for many students. In recruitment discussions, for students as well as for faculty and staff, we need to speak of its diversity, and embed the message that we educate students the way we do because of where we are, not in spite of it. The region includes wide socioeconomic diversity, a visible Amish community, a Native People community spanning two nations, a U.S. Army base and the influences of English- and French-speaking Canada. These are all potential sources for enhancing diversity and inclusion learning experiences.

To ensure that St. Lawrence continues to expand diversity among those invited to become Laurentians for life, significant steps must be taken in raising the diversity profile of the University. Taking the NCG comparison group's mean into account and looking to specific institutions in our comparison group with good track records on diversity, it is possible for St. Lawrence to set a target of enrolling 20% U.S. students of color in four years' time. From current levels (11.8% U.S. students of color in 2013), we believe an increase of approximately 2% (as a percent of the total student body) per year for the next four years is achievable.

![2013 Class Breakdown](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td># students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Students of Color Total</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Target" Class Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assumed SLU class size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th># students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Students of Color Total</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to increasing recruitment of qualified Native American students, we may wish to view another St. Lawrence program as a model. At the establishment of our program of student in Kenya in 1974, the University agreed to enroll two qualified students from Kenya each year, at full cost. Currently, four St. Lawrence alumni who came to the University through the
program serve in that nation's parliament. It would be interesting to see what might happen in our own region if we had a similar commitment to the Akwesasne nation, of admitting two qualified students per year at full tuition. It cannot begin and end with admission, however. Support services that assist students in adjusting to University academic work and culture are necessary as well.

Along with this, the University must retain and reinvigorate our commitment to economic diversity ensuring our commitment to Pell Grant recipients and to our North Country students. As with PDS, the particular diversities of these students go virtually untapped in terms of programming.

An example of the kind of programming that could be encouraged was offered during a student focus group, when a United World College student spoke of his financial dilemmas when coming to Canton. Allowed to pack only 50 pounds, including sufficient winter wear, providing for a Canton winter was difficult, though supplementing his clothing upon arrival on campus was even more difficult. Why? He had no credit card. In his country of origin, no one without a stable income is allowed to incur debt. His story made clear that our efforts to be an inclusive and welcoming community must go beyond simply enrolling more diverse students.

Similarly, in the same focus group, the issue of where African and African American students could get their hair styled was of particular concern, considering the dearth of appropriate salons the North Country. One African student respondent laughed, and replied, "I looked around and saw there was no place to get my hair done. And you know what? I learned to do my own hair."

The cliché is that the children teach us. The reality is that the children teach us. Where we need to be is to provide programs that allow us to teach one another what we bring with us to campus when we come to St. Lawrence.

It is worth stating that St. Lawrence is doing remarkable work in recruiting international students. However, it is important to note that this achievement has resulted in less diversity among international students than is ideal. In two years' time, Chinese students went from 4.3% of all non-Canadian international students to 37.3%. We believe it is possible for us to achieve growth from the current rate of 7.8% of international students on campus in 2013 to 10% over a two-year period. That expansion needs to come, however, from a diverse group of international students.

As stated earlier, the expansion of the United World College program is completely in line with our desired outcomes for diversity and inclusion. Increasing the number of UWC scholars on campus to 40 students, across all four classes, is an achievable goal.

**Faculty/Staff Recruitment and Retention**

It is agreed that we need to broaden our recruitment efforts to be more successful in yielding a diverse applicant pool for faculty and staff positions. This effort should include the
ways that job positions are written and published, the places they are published, and which recruitment fairs in which we participate.

The Jeffrey Campbell Fellows Program, begun in 1990 as the Visiting Graduate Fellows Program, had some success in recruiting as visiting lecturers faculty of color who were close to completing terminal degrees to campus, allowing them to gain teaching experience. Several Fellows remained to become full-time, tenure-track faculty. When the program ended in 2008, due to recession response, it was recommended that the University join the Consortium for Faculty Diversity. Based at Gettysburg College, the group is "committed to increasing the diversity of students, faculty members and curricular offerings at liberal arts colleges with a particular focus on enhancing the diversity of faculty members and of applicants for faculty positions." Due to financial limitations owing to recession response, the University did not join the Consortium. We believe that we should. With the phased retirement program for faculty, we now know when some faculty will retire and could target hiring fellows in positions where we foresee tenure-track openings.

We also endorse expanding the Ambassadors Program put into place as a pilot for 2013-2014 faculty searches to all exempt searches. The Ambassadors Program, modeled after programs at Skidmore, as well as a number of other private northeast liberal arts colleges, provides an opportunity for candidates to ask a faculty or staff member who is not connected to the search process questions about diversity issues, family issues, or anything else that they are thinking about as they consider moving to Canton. This is both a recruitment tool and a means of allowing discussions about those issues to take place away from the search committee, where they would be inappropriate and could have an impact upon decisions. The pilot will be evaluated at the end of the search season and recommendations will be used to modify the program, if necessary, and expand it.

We also believe that the University should work with the New York Six consortium to plan one or two recruiting trips per year, a possibility that has been discussed by members' Chief Academic Officers. After identifying universities that graduate large numbers of faculty of color, we could visit those campuses to market the concept of teaching at a liberal arts college and recruit candidates.

To achieve true diversity and inclusion, St Lawrence also needs to become fully able to provide more social opportunities to increase the sense of community among faculty and staff. In interviews and focus groups conducted by the Commission, the perception of a divide between faculty and staff, particularly hourly staff, was a recurrent theme. It was noted, for example, that the annual winter holiday events and all-employee family picnic are appreciated for the sense of inclusion they bring to the campus community. Where possible, the University should explore additional ways to bring the entire employee group together, encouraging dialogue across and between departments and divisions.

Currently, there is a modest mentoring program for faculty. This needs to be expanded, not only for faculty, but also to staff. Community and Employee Relations has begun planning for a community organizations "fair," similar to the student organizations fair held in the fall, for recent hires and their partners, to introduce them to volunteer opportunities in the North Country.
and provide an opportunity for networking. We support this, and encourage departments including the Dean's Office, Human Resources and others across campus to work together to develop an organized mentorship program for all new faculty and staff. We also strongly believe that there is an urgent need for the creation of more ally and support groups that support students, faculty and staff, along the lines of their diversities, e.g., First-Generation and LGBTQ.

In all, to get where we need to be, St. Lawrence must develop a diversity representative program for all faculty and staff searches, with further exploration needed as to whether that representative is someone already on the search committee, or someone apart from the committee. Both approaches have benefits and further study is required.

**Curriculum/Co-Curriculum**

Why pursue diversity? Simply put, because diversity aids in critical thinking and contributes to excellent teaching and learning. Beyond that, according to recent studies, the effect of diversity exposure is "curvilinear," meaning that sporadic or initial contacts with it have little or even negative effects as they mostly reinforce stereotypes. As with all learning, real growth occurs with repeated encounters.12

From the moment students identify St. Lawrence as a potential choice for college, through the admissions process, matriculation and graduation, we have countless opportunities to prepare them to be critical thinkers in a multi-cultural world.

When students arrive on campus, Orientation programming is key to their acclimation, and in terms of diversity and inclusion, both Orientation and the First-Year Program must make diversity programming more central to their missions. Looking around the country, we saw many excellent programs, including one at Illinois Wesleyan University, where its "Engaging Diversity" pre-orientation program days bring white students who are interested in learning about U.S. diversity and social justice issues to campus three days prior to the all-student orientation. In addition, the college also offers separate pre-orientations for U.S. students of color and international students, and has structured the program in ways that allow for all three groups to engage in early, meaningful dialogue and make connections.

Having a diverse population is only the beginning in creating the kind of campus community we would like to see. The next step is creating and institutionalizing an intercultural, vibrant space where people of various identities and interests enjoy learning from and about each other socially and intellectually. St. Lawrence has many of the elements to create such a climate. To heighten and add to our residential and recreational experience, we need to assess which of our residential and recreational programs bridge those existing elements, versus those that bond students together over one common theme, and create the kind of signature program that encourages interaction between groups.

It is here that the word "ally" comes strongly to mind. A signature St. Lawrence program could address a variety of the perceived problems on campus, from incidents of binge drinking, particularly among first-semester, first-year women, to the isolation of under-represented students. For example, a designated person on each hall, floor, fraternity, sorority, theme house and social space could be committed to being the ally to any person in need, escorting over-served students from a party; inviting, outfitting and accompanying a student from an urban environment on Peak Weekend; or illuminating someone who hails from somewhere south of the Equator on the finer points of ice hockey. The feeling of community Laurentians often cite no doubt includes gestures like these by allies who are here. By marshalling and organizing what are now individual efforts, our community will be made stronger.

Finding ways to shift the culture so that students find it "cool" to interact socially with different types and groups of people is never easy, but it can begin with signature St. Lawrence thinking that might be initiated in a contest, encouraged with an FYP Cup competition, and reinvigorated each semester so that diversity awareness both begins early and becomes a badge that bonds.

This kind of thinking needs to penetrate all of our traditions, since traditions convey strong messages about the values of institutions. Events, including the Quad Experience, Matriculation, Convocation, Commencement, Moving-Up Day, Peak Weekend, Senior Week, Homecoming and Reunion, for example, should convey the diversity and inclusion values embedded at the core of the University. To ensure this, these tradition need to be assessed on a regular basis.

Included in those traditions is our Greek system, and while its membership represents a small percentage of the total student enrollment, the groups continue to have a strong influence as a traditional part of the campus culture. While traditions may be valued, to preserve value, they often must change over time. The Greek system, along with other University traditions, must be examined in the same light as other aspects of the University, including the messages they send to potential students. It remains unclear what message is sent by the existence of only two fraternities and four sororities, except to say that the message itself is indistinct and therefore, warrants further review.

"Choice architecture," a phrase from behavioral economics, relates a method through which to provide spaces that nudge students into interactions outside their comfort zone. The claim of its proponents is that without such spaces we default to sameness, while with them, we adopt new, more encompassing identities, and a broader sense of "we." Closely linked to the need for St. Lawrence students to have more meaningful interactions across difference is the need to expand and/or create institutional structures, spaces and practices that foster these interactions from the first day students arrive on campus.

We know for certain that, as stated in a recent piece in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, "social-capital benefits accrue when generations of diverse citizens live and work together for decades." We need to be at a place on campus where we bridge in a common cause, not merely bridge for the sake of bridging, and while these efforts take time – a difficult commodity on a college campus, where the natural four-year turnover requires a particular kind
of stewardship to embed such change – we must address this now. Living separately together is not an option for a school whose mission includes providing excellent education.

**Programming/Training**

Many of the colleges and universities with whom we compare ourselves offer diversity programming that may provide models. In addition to the Illinois Wesleyan program mentioned earlier, Hamilton College has a program called "First Year Forward" that gives under-represented students early career starts, particularly to first-generation students beginning in their first year. It includes monthly meetings and one-on-one work with career counselors.

One thing that became evident during our inquiry is the need to rebrand some of our existing programs. For instance, we should never underestimate the diversity provided by sending our students "abroad" at home, as evidenced by our Adirondack Semester and Sustainability Semester programs, both of which expose students to the diversity that exists in the region. After reading a piece in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* on this topic, we were reassured about repositioning the North Country as a major source of diversity.  

The Commission considered strongly recommending increasing off-campus study. Certain difficulties arise when doing so. For instance, there are invariably exceptions to "required" off-campus study, as certain students cannot (due to medical or other limitations) or should not (due to disciplinary, academic, or other issues) study off campus. There are also admission considerations to this recommendation, since while increasing numbers of students choose St. Lawrence because of our off-campus study opportunities, others might decline to attend preferring not to be away from campus for a full term (two-semester athletes, for example). The resource implications of any increase in participation would be significant, but possibly not proportional to the increased numbers of students, particularly if we chose to increase financial aid for summer and January short-term programs. Current financial aid is much less for these programs than for semester programs, limiting student access and total participation rates. Directing additional resources to these opportunities would allow us to open more off-campus study options to more students, increase the total proportion of our students who have an off-campus study experience to perhaps 75-80% or higher, and do so in a way that would enhance our appeal to prospective students.

Facilitating dialogues across campus is a key to our success in embedding diversity and inclusion at St. Lawrence. One interesting model for doing so is located at the National Intergroup Dialogue Institute, located at the University of Michigan. Our adaptation of this program could train students to lead peer-to-peer "dialogues across difference" in our community. St. Lawrence students could be required to take an "Introduction to Dialogue" course for which...
they could receive academic credit, perhaps fulfilling part of the new curriculum's diversity requirement. After successfully completing training, students would then facilitate peer-to-peer dialogues. This idea again touches on the need for an increased mentoring culture at St. Lawrence, since students would initially facilitate the dialogues under the mentorship of a faculty member or residential life staff member who has also been trained in Intergroup Dialogue. Incentives (course reductions or compensation) could be given to faculty and staff for their investment of time, and all faculty and staff who commit to lead the program could attend the University of Michigan training program. To build interest in the program the University could fund a two-day workshop for interested faculty and staff to be led by a trained facilitator.

No program for increasing and embedding diversity and inclusion can thrive without the inclusion of our student leaders. Providing diversity and inclusion training to organization/club leaders, Greek officers, and Thelmo officers empowers them to become mentors and guides to others in facilitating cross-cultural connections on campus. It is also critical to our success that all Orientation Leaders and Residence Coordinators have some multicultural/educational background or training experience as a mandatory requirement for achieving those positions. Their training should be updated on a basis as determined by the Student Life office.

We might also consider a First-Year Program college with leadership in diversity/intercultural competency as its central academic and co-curricular outcome. The members of this college, along with PDS scholars, could become leaders of the Intergroup Dialogue program mentioned above and embody the "students teach students" approach.

Further, the St. Lawrence University Student Activities Fund (SLUSAF) should provide additional and/or incentive funding to student groups that work across difference with other student groups and/or theme houses to sponsor programs or events for the campus. SLUSAF should assess student organizations/clubs and their activities to foster intercultural relations on campus as part of their re-application for funding each year.

Public Relations/Publications/Advertising

Engaging diverse students through technology is a hot topic in current education publications.15 Beliefs about how to do so range widely, though one thing is certain: it is a topic we need to explore.

Options include the use of wikis – web applications with no one, defined owner – to raise questions and promote curricular and co-curricular discussion about diversity and the use of paratexting to create the same kind of interstitial world between disciplines that texting television fans enjoy while watching a hit show.16 Establishing a hashtag (#sludiverse, for example) would help create space on Twitter to continue discussion and extend content outside the classroom.

15 http://chronicle.com/article/Diverse-Students-Go-Digital/139645/
Along with rankings that rate colleges and universities by everything from how "green" they are to how much graduates earn, institutions are now being rated by their levels of diversity and inclusion. While much like the oft-disputed U.S. News & World Report rankings that lack the nuance to accurately compare institutions but are devoured by the public, these lists are both similarly incomplete and widely read. The ranges in rankings includes, but is not limited to, a U.S. News ranking by Pell Grant recipients; a U.S. News ranking by students' ethnic diversity; a Forbes list of "most diverse colleges"; and the Campus Pride Index ranking of colleges and universities that take into account LGBQT programming and accommodation. Quite simply, we need to get on these lists, in order to increase awareness of the St. Lawrence diversity and inclusion "brand."

To do so requires not only creating the kind of signature program of which we are capable, but also promoting that program to those students looking for a great college experience. The placement of our diversity initiative and programming on the website is a key to this success, as is the content it includes.

Much-needed additions to our website include more prominent placement of our Native American programs; regular updates in all website and campus publications to reflect a campus commitment to our diversity of diversities; highlighting and heightening our understanding that diversity includes race, religion, gender, sexuality, gender identity, physical and mental limitations, economics, geography and more.

Other cultural resources would also be helpful, including a regularly updated guide to services in the North Country. This could be compiled in partnership with area colleges, and could be used by faculty, staff and students to highlight services of particular interest to diverse populations.

In terms of representations of diversity in the North Country, we need go no farther than to North Country Public Radio to witness the kind of cultural breadth that we live in. In fact, NCPR provides an excellent model for combatting the chagrin mentioned previously. Their coverage has the tone of appreciation, neither over-romancing the area, nor being condescending. The tone they hit could contribute to our own understanding of the value of our place in the world.

The greatest challenge in representing diversity and inclusion is the eye of the beholder, making the issue of how we report and represent diversity in our publications a sensitive one, and one that requires continued vigilance. Over-representing diversity may prove just as damaging to a brand as the perception of a lack of diversity.\(^{17}\) Over-representing diversity might once have been a topic only for higher education publications, but it is now getting mass-market coverage,\(^{18}\) creating a far greater threat to our brand. To get where we need to be, we need to engage on every platform and understand that measurements of diversity include far more than race. At present, we have limited representation of the St. Lawrence experience through videos,


\(^{18}\) [http://www.npr.org/2013/12/29/257765543/a-campus-more-colorful-than-reality-beware-that-college-brochure](http://www.npr.org/2013/12/29/257765543/a-campus-more-colorful-than-reality-beware-that-college-brochure)
which could be a way for the diverse voices on our campus to speak for themselves. The University would benefit from adding staff to accomplish this.

**Alumni Engagement/Development Efforts**

As stated earlier, the University offers the Presidential Diversity Scholarship (PDS), a $128,000 scholarship ($32,000 per year, starting with the Class of 2017), to qualified students. First awarded in 2000-2001 to encourage further diversity in the student body, and thereby ultimately enhance educational benefits for all students, in celebration of the 10th year of the Presidential Diversity Scholarship, the dollar value of the scholarship was increased and the program expanded to include students of any racial background who have demonstrated commitment to, and appreciation for, racial and ethnic diversity.

In addition, through the Douglas Foundation, movie legend and proud St. Lawrence University alumnus Kirk Douglas '39 and his wife, Anne Douglas, have given or pledged nearly $7.5 million to St. Lawrence to support a diversity scholarship in their name, started in 1999.

A recent gift of $5 million enhanced the Kirk Douglas Scholarship fund. The purpose of the fund is to support students who represent diversity, have financial need and demonstrate excellence in academics and leadership. This is the largest endowed scholarship at St. Lawrence and the recent addition to that fund expands the availability of this premier scholarship to all four classes. It was previously available only to juniors and seniors.

The establishment of the fund speaks to the existence of qualified donors to give to diversity scholarships, and perhaps even diversity programs on campus. We need to meet those donors, get them up to date on our diversity efforts, and explore with them the potential to fully live up to our heritage of providing an opportunity for the St. Lawrence experience to all deserving students.

At issue is the question of how people wish to be identified after graduation. You are a lifelong Laurentian, but are you also a lifelong HEOP student, once you are the head of cardiology at a good regional hospital? In other words, best practices must be employed to establish how our graduates wish to be identified.

Also at issue is the perennial problem of how our various audiences view change. Every move toward diversity and inclusion is a move change away from the St. Lawrence alumni know and love, and toward one that is more competitive in a more diverse world. But sentimentality and its effects on development and resource-building is a conversation that needs to take place at every level of alumni engagement. If it is possible to begin and sustain the message of "Thank you for giving to efforts that contribute to transformative change on this campus," it would aid greatly in these efforts.

What is not at issue is that digital platforms make distance irrelevant, and that exploration of bringing alumni to campus to recruit, retain and improve diversity and inclusion at St.
Lawrence is now more possible than ever. In fact, the access provided in the new digital platforms is almost without limit. This access to our diverse alumni base must be explored fully.

Of course, there is no discussion of alumni engagement without addressing the St. Lawrence Alumni Executive Council, which has a history as a vibrant and hard-working group whose efforts at reaching our alumni base are strong and whose results are excellent.

According to available records, from 1915 to the present, 52 people have served as president of the Council, seven of whom have been women, two in the past seven years. The Alumni Executive Council has, to date, included 335 alumni, of whom 178 (53%) were or are women and 19 (6%) were or are alumni representing racial or ethnic diversity.

We encourage the Alumni Council to engage in the same self-study we are asking of the University's Board of Trustees – to conduct an audit, to reflect on their diversities, and to adjust as needed to reflect the changing diversities of our entire community.

Building the teaching of philanthropy into our curriculum is also essential to our success. The Emma Willard School in Troy, N.Y., has a club called Phila, funded by one generous donor with one bequest, whose members give away approximately 5% of the bequest each year after choosing a topic of concern in the community, calling for applications, reading the grant applications and making site visits. These students graduate with a sense of giving back in clear and practical terms. Can we tie this kind of club to our diversity efforts? We think we can.

Paul Quinn College in Dallas recently launched the Center for Fundraising and Philanthropy, a training center for fundraising and development, which remains one of a few national undergraduate fundraising programs. The goal of the program is to deepen students' understanding of philanthropy. In addition to the center, students created a new collegiate chapter of the Association for Fundraising Professionals.

Why try? Because, as stated in a recent piece in The Chronicle of Higher Education, "when students felt that campus leaders created affirming environments for them, students were likely to volunteer and help sustain alumni groups" and were likely to make "substantial financial gifts."19

Assessment

Our history of measuring and assessing diversity is rich and strong, including the Presidential Commission on Coeducation (1974); a Hewlett Foundation grant to study Pluralism and Unity (1998), the Hardwick Day marketing study (2010), Recession Response, Part 2 (2011), the Teagle Foundation grant to assess diversity (2007-2012), and the Strategic Map (2011), which led to this Commission.

19 http://chronicle.com/article/Where-Have-All-the-Queer/139653/
Among the many things we have learned over the years, one fact remains unchanged: those colleges and universities with the highest endowments have been able to provide more access to under-represented groups, and, for the most part, have better records of diversity programming.\textsuperscript{20}

The other conclusion that is easy to draw is that diversity is difficult to measure.\textsuperscript{21} Despite this, we need to move from thinking about diversity as an end goal related to the composition of the student body to thinking about diversity as an opportunity for organizational learning that is connected to our mission. If we do so, we will achieve and sustain institution-wide goals for diversity.

We assess ourselves regularly and scrupulously, as evidenced by the work of the Institutional Research office. Along with our internal indexes, many external products exist that allow for measurement of our progress toward diversity, including the Equity Scorecard, a process that allows team members to research their institution's data and practices.\textsuperscript{22}

Measuring our return on diversity and inclusion efforts must begin immediately. While the near or distant future may or may not include the hiring of a Chief Diversity Officer and the establishment of a center or an Office for Diversity and Inclusion, assessment of our diversity and inclusion efforts can begin with the formation of a joint committee that includes, but is not limited to, the President and Senior Staff, who both monitor those efforts and make regular reports to the Board and the campus community.

\section*{III. How We’re Going to Get There}

\textbf{Requirements, Recommendations & Suggestions}

\subsection*{I. Planning/Governance/Policy}

\textbf{Requirements}

a. The University should develop a strategic map for diversity and inclusion, as part of the overall Strategic Map, and establish goals and objectives that can be measured. It should include a financial plan to ensure adequate funding of diversity and inclusion initiatives. Embedding diversity and inclusion into the Strategic Map as a goal will be one of the most powerful ways to make our vision sustainable.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{20} \url{http://chronicle.com/article/Where-Have-All-the-Queer/139653/}
\item \textsuperscript{21} \url{http://chronicle.com/article/How-Colleges-Measure-the/139663/}
\item \textsuperscript{22} \url{http://cue.usc.edu/our_tools/the_equity_scorecard.html}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
b. A Diversity Task Force should be established, perhaps modeled on the Diversity Progress Committee at Earlham. The task force might consist of the Vice President of the University and Dean of Academic Affairs; Vice President and Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid; Vice President and Dean of Student Life; Vice President of Community and Employee Relations; the Director of Athletics; a representative from the faculty, and the President of the Thelomathesian Society. The task force should meet at least once per semester, and early in each academic year, gather information from throughout campus in order to submit a report to the President detailing progress on the Diversity and Inclusion goals of the Strategic Map. The report should include items for the coming year's agenda, as well as continuing challenges.

c. In order to locate diversity and inclusion at the core of the institution, the University's Mission Statement should be reconsidered to include a commitment to diversity and inclusion, noting our historic connection to those values.

d. The Board of Trustees and Alumni Executive Council should perform the same thorough audit of their cultures that is being asked of the campus and community at large, making every effort to determine what, if any, cultural changes need to be implemented.

Recommendations

a. Progress on diversity and inclusion goals in the Strategic Map should be reported regularly to the University's Board of Trustees through its "dashboard," and communicated regularly to the campus community.

b. A committee should be established of individuals whose job descriptions include responsibilities for diversity and inclusion. It should include, but not be limited to, representatives from Academic Affairs, Admissions/Financial Aid, Student Life, Disability and Accessibility Services, the Chaplain's Office and Human Resources. They should meet regularly to discuss issues of concern, take action on stated objectives and monitor progress on goals. This group would function apart from and differently from the Diversity Task Force proposed elsewhere in this report, working more with day-to-day operations.

c. The University should conduct a campus diversity and inclusion climate study for faculty and staff every three to five years, and openly share the results.

Return to Summary

II. Staffing

Recommendations

a. As the Requirements, Recommendations and Suggestions in this report are discussed and acted upon by the campus community, consideration should be given to the costs and benefits of adding a position of Chief Diversity Officer to the staff. Position responsibilities, reporting structure and authority should be determined during that process.
b. The University should expand efforts to engage a more diverse group of alumni and in order to do so, staffing in Advancement should increase accordingly. Similarly, in order to appropriately engage a more diverse group of alumni with career networking and career planning activities – benefitting both students and alumni – staffing within Career Planning should increase accordingly.

c. The University should explore the costs and benefits of creating, perhaps in partnership with New York Six or North Country institutions, an ombudsperson position, to independently arbitrate cases of alleged discrimination.

d. The University should consider adding staff in University Communications to produce video content for the website, as an additional method of representing the variety of diverse voices on campus.

Return to Summary

III. Facilities

Requirements

a. The University should begin exploring alternative locations for the offices associated with services now housed in the Whitman Annex to a more central location that will give those services deserved visibility and make the students using those services feel welcomed and valued.

Recommendations

a. While accommodation is now made for persons with mobility limitations, the University should embark upon an accessibility audit of all facilities and develop a priority list of those facilities that are in the greatest need of renovation or retrofitting. The list should be reviewed regularly when annual consideration of capital improvements takes place.

b. As the Requirements, Recommendations and Suggestions in this report are discussed and acted upon by the campus community, consideration should be given to the establishment of a Center for Diversity and Inclusion. The costs and benefits of the facility, functionality and purpose should be determined during that process. The process must also include how the facility could be financed.

Suggestions

a. The University should establish gender-neutral restroom facilities in visible locations where students live, study and gather, and where faculty and staff work. Location determinations, associated costs and other considerations may be determined by existing governmental bodies, such as the Buildings & Grounds Committee.

Return to Summary
IV. Student Recruitment and Retention

Requirements

a. The University should aggressively recruit students from United World College schools, to achieve a goal of enrolling a minimum of 40 students, across all classes, per year.

b. The University should reinstitute campus service expectations for students who are awarded specific scholarships, including Presidential Diversity Scholars, International Scholars (e.g., UWC), and Community Service and Leadership Award recipients, in connection with a mentoring program. This could include serving as mentors or facilitating dialogues, or presentations to first-year students at matriculation, First-Year Convocation and First-Year College orientation meetings.

c. The University should submit information for inclusion in the Campus Pride Index, an organization promoting higher education institutions with LGBTQ-friendly policies, and work toward obtaining the highest ranking within that index.

d. The University should participate in the Campus Religious and Spiritual Climate Survey administered by the Interfaith Youth Core, to assist students in navigating religious diversity's challenges and possibilities.

e. The University should, in consultation with attorneys, review, re-visit and if necessary revise its policies for the use of service and support animals.

Recommendations

a. St. Lawrence should explore the potential for establishing continuing partnerships with high schools that have populations of under-represented students, perhaps revisiting what was successful in the former Pre-Collegiate Opportunity Program (PCOP) as a model.

b. The University should explore the potential for the recruitment of more qualified Native American students from throughout New York State and New England, perhaps committing to enrolling two students from Akwesasne per year at full need, similar to our agreement with the government of Kenya.

c. The Commission strongly encourages the University to maintain its commitment to students qualifying for Pell Grants and to students from the North Country region. Both groups contribute significantly to an environment of diversity and inclusion.
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V. Faculty/Staff Recruitment and Retention

Requirements

a. Trained representatives from Human Resources should meet with search committees for faculty and staff positions at the beginning of the process, to explain best practices in developing applicant pools and structuring campus visits.

b. Development of a Diversity Stewards or similar program, perhaps modeled on the program at Juniata College, is strongly encouraged, with the goal of placing a trained diversity and inclusion advocate on every search committee.

c. Further development of an Ambassadors Program by the Dean's Office is strongly encouraged, and the program should be monitored by the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs to determine if candidates who sought assistance from the Ambassadors were more likely to be hired and were more likely to stay. While the program must be continually monitored and adjusted if necessary, a full review of the program should take place after three years.

d. A program similar to the Ambassadors Program should be developed for the recruitment and retention of staff, with a similar commitment to assessment and review.

e. The University should, in consultation with attorneys, review, re-visit and, if necessary, revise its policies for the use of service and support animals by employees.

f. Budgets for position advertisements should be increased, in order to allow fuller and more flexible language describing the University's commitment to diversity and inclusion.

Recommendations

a. The University should explore the creation and development of a mentoring program for all new faculty and staff to assist them in understanding our culture and our community. The program would require commitment of time and resources from a number of divisions and offices across the University and their combined efforts must be coordinated through regular meetings and other communication.

b. Staff in the Dean's Office, Human Resources and University Communications should work together to develop language for job postings to reflect the University's commitment to diversity and inclusion as institutional priorities.

c. The University should become a member of the Consortium for Faculty Diversity, housed at Gettysburg College, which has as a focus enhancing the diversity of faculty members and of applicants for faculty positions.
Suggestions

a. The University should explore extending opportunities to enroll, free of charge, in English as a Second Language classes to family members of faculty and staff, as a method of helping them adjust to and enjoy their new lives in the North Country.

b. The University should work with colleagues at the New York Six consortium institutions to hold events for the purpose of achieving greater diversity among faculty and staff.

Return to Summary

VI. Curriculum/Co-Curriculum

Requirements

a. It should be a goal that students who graduate from the University do so with diversity and inclusion "acumen," developed over their years at St. Lawrence. In addition to required courses in the curriculum, it should include experiential learning through study abroad, internships, work experiences, service learning and co-curricular experiences with campus groups and organizations. Where possible, the University should employ a "students teaching students" approach, with upper-class students serving as mentors. A student's diversity and inclusiveness acumen should be considered as a learning goal.

b. The University should consider incorporating a ceremony or ritual into its established traditions, such as at Matriculation, during the Quad Experience or at First-Year Convocation, where students would commit to upholding St. Lawrence's diversity and inclusion policies and practices, similar to pledging academic integrity. A program to consider as a model exists at Vanderbilt University's Divinity School and Graduate Department of Religion (http://divinity.vanderbilt.edu/about/purposes.php).

c. The University should explore development of an Intergroup Dialogue program, perhaps modeled on the program at the University of Michigan, with a goal of training students to lead "dialogues across difference." FYP-like incentives (course reduction or compensation) should be considered for faculty who invest time into the development of this programming, along with funding for participation in training.

d. Research and review of the University's Residence Life policies should be undertaken, following current best practices regarding transgender issues.

e. The University should explore ways to provide financial aid for students seeking short-term international study opportunities, including summer and between semesters, which would provide more students with this educationally valuable experience.

f. Individuals with responsibility for planning the University's many traditional events – Matriculation, Convocation, the Quad Experience, Commencement, Moving-Up Day, Peak Weekend, Senior Week, Homecoming and Reunion, for example – should incorporate diversity
and inclusion concerns into planning. Consideration should be given to how each tradition is promoted by the University as well, mindfully examining the messages the events convey to prospective and current students, graduates and employees.

**Recommendations**

a. St. Lawrence should consider developing and hosting a conference of the New York Six consortium institutions for students whose research promotes and advances diversity and inclusiveness.

b. Supporting the recommendation in the report by David Hall Associates, the University's student athletes should undergo additional training on LGBTQ and other diversity and inclusion issues.

c. Given that the last full examination of the University's Greek system took place in 1993, a review should take place, to determine its appropriate place as a traditional element in the contemporary St. Lawrence environment.

d. Summer University Fellowship opportunities could be enhanced for projects that promote diversity and inclusiveness. Academic departments should be encouraged to support student projects with those themes.

e. Students of color should continue to be "clustered" in First-Year Program colleges, to assist in alleviating feelings of isolation, at least until the percentage of students of color increases to a point where this is no longer necessary. Continual review of this practice should take place.

**Return to Summary**

**VII. Programming/Training**

**Requirements**

a. First-year student Orientation should include programming addressing diversity and inclusion. All student Orientation Leaders and student Residence Life staff should undergo training specifically designed to equip them to work with students on these issues. A program similar to the Illinois Wesleyan pre-orientation programs could serve as a model. Wherever possible, new and emerging technologies should be leveraged to assist in this process.

b. St. Lawrence should develop a signature "ally" program that includes providing support for faculty, staff and students from under-represented groups. While these programs at many colleges and universities exist for the support of students and are coordinated through the Student Life division, it could have broader involvement and include support and mentorship of faculty and staff.

c. The Presidential Diversity Scholar program should be revamped. Currently, the University states that "Once on campus, Presidential Diversity Scholars are expected to participate in
activities planned for this group of students and coordinated by the Dean of Student Life," however, we have failed to follow through on this expectation. The program should include training for the involved students to become mentors and campus leaders and they should be required to participate successfully in this programming.

d. All student leaders should receive training in diversity and inclusion issues, encouraging them to educate their peers and work across difference between and among student organizations.

Recommendations

a. Diversity and inclusion topics should be included in new faculty and staff orientations and other faculty/staff education events or opportunities, including Winter Institute, Staff Development Day, May College, Management 101 and others.

Suggestions

a. The University should consider adding awards at Moving-Up Day or other appropriate occasions that would go to groups for diversity/inclusiveness programming and groups that worked together to foster intergroup dialogue. Awards to individuals should also be considered.

b. The University should consider investing in programming social activities for faculty and staff that foster communication and relationship-building across departments and divisions.

c. SLUSAF should provide additional and/or incentive funding to student groups that work across difference to sponsor programs or events for the campus. SLUSAF should also assess the activities of student organizations/clubs, with consideration for how they have fostered intercultural relations on campus, as part of their re-application for funding each year.
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VIII. Public Relations/Publications/Advertising

Requirements

a. A distinct area of the University's website should be developed that gathers in one prominent location information about the many and varied aspects of diversity and inclusion at the University, including Admissions, Human Resources, Academic Affairs, Student Life, Accommodative Services, international study and more. The University should consider bringing together its many resources with a concerted marketing/branding effort, such as the University of Maryland's "Rise Above" campaign (http://www.diversity.umd.edu/) and the University of Colorado at Boulder's Building Community Through Diversity campaign (http://www.colorado.edu/pba/surveys/divrsty/execsum.htm).

b. Online marketing should include search-engine optimization language that accurately reflects the University's goals for diversity and inclusion.
c. In consultation, University Communications should work to include information in online and print marketing materials that reflect the broadest possible definitions of diversity and inclusion. In order to accomplish this, communication beyond still images should take place, to appropriately represent, for example, members of the LGBTQ community, individuals requiring accommodation and countries of origin.

**Recommendations**

a. The University should develop language for marketing materials accurately representing the diversity of the North Country to potential students, faculty and staff.

b. In partnership with area colleges, the University should work to develop and maintain a shared guide to the region for use by faculty, staff and students, highlighting services of particular interest to a diverse population.

**Suggestions**

a. The University should establish and maintain a timeline, housed on the University website, documenting our diversity and inclusion history and traditions.
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**IX. Alumni Engagement/Development Efforts**

**Requirements**

a. The University should expand efforts to have actively engaged alumni become a more diverse and inclusive group, reflecting the scope of diversity outlined elsewhere in this report. New contacts, new forms of communication, travel to new regions, new programming and greater networking should all be instituted to inform and involve alumni, parents and friends.

b. The development office and the Alumni Council should fully explore the use of digital technology and all available platforms to provide access to our diverse alumni base, to connect our students to that base, and to include programming that touches on recruitment, retention, internship inquiry and career planning.

**Recommendations**

a. Additional types of affiliate reunions should be explored, for alumni out of the University at five-year, 10-year and further intervals.

b. Development, enrollment and alumni data should be disaggregated to identify new and ongoing markers of the fluid nature of diversity and inclusion.
c. Development efforts should be expanded to better promote the University's diversity and inclusion goals, including diversity fundraising opportunities at lower giving levels than the Douglas scholarship.

Suggestions

a. Discussions with the Senior Class about its gift should include consideration of gifts that promote and foster a vibrant environment for diversity and inclusion. Students should be strongly encouraged to leave the University more diverse than it was upon their arrival.

X. Assessment

Requirements

a. Measurable desired outcomes and benchmarks for diversity and inclusion should be developed and progress tracked through the Board of Trustee's "dashboard," as well as in communications with the campus community, and reported annually by the Diversity Task Force.

b. Exit interviews with faculty and staff should address concerns about diversity and inclusion directly.

c. Questions about diversity and inclusion experiences and perceptions should be added to the first-year student survey and senior-year graduation survey.

Recommendations

a. Research should be conducted with students who were admitted to St. Lawrence, but chose not to enroll, to determine if concerns and perceptions surrounding diversity and inclusion were factors in the decision-making process.
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