

Edited by Debra Satz



List of Contributors ix

Debra Satz

-

AQ: In chapter the term is "Liberal". Please confirm which has to be followed.

Stuart White

Christopher J. Lebron

- Richard M. Locke

- Martha C. Nussbaum

5

THE CASE OF BROWN UNIVERSITY'S DIVERSITY AND
INCLUSION ACTION PLAN

Richard M. Locke

5.1 INTRODUCTION

C5.P2 This chapter describes Brown University's experience with developing its own diversity and inclusion action plan (DIAP). The development of the DIAP was a collective effort. But the Office of the Provost took the lead in engaging the various groups of students, staff, faculty, and alumni and in responding to their demands throughout the process of developing our university-wide plan of action. The

intensity of the student mobilization around these issues was greater than anything the university had witnessed in decades. Beginning in mid-October and continuing for several months, Brown experienced multiple student rallies and protests, the occupation of University Hall (our administration building), and scores of petitions, “open letters,” and community-wide meetings with concerned students, faculty, staff, and alumni. As a relatively new university leader (I had been appointed four months before the protests began), I was unprepared for the intensity and tone of the mobilization that took place. And although I have worked on issues of labor/social justice in the United States and abroad for years, I came to realize how little I knew about the challenges facing HUG faculty, students, and staff at universities like Brown.

C5.P3 However, relying on the insights I had gained from Josh Cohen’s work on deliberation (see various essays in Cohen 2009), I was able to guide a process that led to the development of one of the most ambitious university diversity and inclusion action plans in the country (see appendix A). More specifically, I drew on Cohen’s arguments about the importance (for democracy) of organizing deliberative processes in which participants are treated with respect, as “equals,” and that competing arguments/alternative views are debated openly and with reference to the common good (in this case, the good of the university community). As part of our process to develop a university-wide DIAP, we organized a series of open and broadly participative meetings in which contentious issues were debated (often repeatedly) before new, commonly shared positions were embraced by all participants. Power differentials (between administrators and faculty, among faculty of different rank, and between faculty and students/staff) were of course present in the background of all these discussions. But the deliberative process guiding all these meetings was structured to moderate these power differentials and promote respectful debate among all participants. The decisions/proposals that ultimately emerged from these discussions were the result not of power dynamics, with the more powerful groups imposing their own views, nor the result of distributive bargaining among competing groups trying to maximize their own self-interest. Instead, many of the proposals and goals that were put forward in the final draft of the university’s DIAP arose through open, reasoned discussion and debate of alternative conceptions of the common good. This same process continues to shape the implementation of this plan. This chapter describes the process we undertook at Brown and seeks to generalize from this case study to argue that deliberation can be an effective model for how universities can address an array of complex issues they face these days.

C5.S2

5.2 BACKGROUND: UNFULFILLED PROMISES

C5.P4

For hundreds of years, historical legacies of oppression and discrimination have barred certain groups based on their gender, race, religion, sexuality, and socioeconomic class from access to and/or full participation in higher education in the United States. This was especially true for groups that self-identify as African American, Hispanic, American Indian, Alaskan Native, and Native Hawaiian—what the U.S. Department of Education refers to as “historically underrepresented groups” (HUGs). As a 250+ year-old liberal arts university, Brown shares much of this history. In fact, Brown was founded and originally funded by a slave-trading family. Because Brown is based in Providence, Rhode Island (the eventual home of Roger Williams), it was always more tolerant of religious diversity. But it took many years for Brown to come to terms with its history (Brown University Steering Committee on Slavery and Justice 2007) and over time, it has opened its gates to women, blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. But the relationship between these historically underrepresented groups and the university has not always been easy.

C5.P5

Since a “walkout” by black students in 1968, students have repeatedly protested and demanded that Brown University commit greater resources and effort to further diversify its students, faculty, and staff. The university has responded, in turn, with various proposals aimed at supporting existing HUG students and faculty on campus and embarking on a variety of initiatives aimed at increasing the compositional diversity of the Brown community. These cycles of protest and institutional response seem to occur every decade. As part of my work on the university’s diversity and inclusion action plan, I read past diversity plans released by the university in 1968, 1972, 1986, 1992, 2001, and 2006. I was astounded to see how many of the same issues we are struggling with today were raised in these past cycles of protest and how many of our current strategies to address these issues echo proposed solutions elaborated in the past. Notwithstanding this long history of protest and institutional response, and what I assume to be the good intentions of former university administrators to implement the proposals in these past plans, progress has been mixed. For example, over the last ten years, the percentage of undergraduate students from HUGs has grown from 14.1 percent (2004–05) to 18.6 percent (2014–15) while the percentage of HUG graduate students has grown from 5.7 to 8.8 percent in those same years. And while the percentage of medical students from HUGs is impressive (23.3% in 2014–15), the percentage of HUG faculty in the university as a whole has hovered between 7 and 8 percent for the last decade.

C5.P6

The lack of significant progress on diversifying the student body and faculty, as well as the perceived lack of understanding of and appreciation for issues of race,

power, and privilege within the university community (especially among white faculty members), provoked a new round of student protests in the fall of 2015. This latest wave of protests also took place within a broader context shaped by a national movement (Black Lives Matter) contesting the systematic murder of people of color. Together, these local and national factors combined to generate an intense wave of student protests at Brown and many other universities and colleges across the country. Once again, Brown students demanded greater diversity of the faculty, the student body, and the senior administration. Once again, the students demanded greater investments in courses and academic programs that promoted awareness of and appreciation for issues of race and ethnicity in the United States. And once again, HUG faculty demanded greater support for their work, improved mentoring programs, and more robust recruitment efforts to grow their ranks.

C5.P7 These demands were expressed in different ways. Some demands were sent as emails to the university's president and provost. Others were expressed in "open letters" published in the student newspaper, *The Brown Daily Herald*, as well as the *Huffington Post*. Most were communicated verbally at different rallies; meetings with particular groups of students, staff, and faculty; open community fora; and during the occupation of University Hall.

C5.S3

5.3 RESPONSE: CRAFTING A UNIVERSITY DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION ACTION PLAN

C5.P8

In order to respond to these different demands and develop a coherent but realistic plan, the university president, vice president for diversity and inclusion, and I aggregated these different demands and drafted an action plan. This draft plan was released to the community on November 19, 2015. In an effort to solicit and collect feedback from the broader community, we invited all Brown faculty, students, and staff to comment on the draft and its specific proposals, and we created a website where members of the Brown community could anonymously submit suggested amendments, criticisms, edits, and general feedback. This online feedback process continued until January 8, 2016. The goal was to collect and analyze the feedback and integrate it into a final draft of the DIAP, which was to be released on February 1, 2016. We also invited faculty, staff, students, and alumni to send us emails with their suggestions, criticisms, and feedback. By early January, we had received 720 unique online comments, edits, anecdotes, and additional proposals, as well as 35 emails. In addition to this online/email feedback, we organized numerous community fora and meetings with specific groups to discuss the draft plan and solicit

feedback. Along with my chief of staff and assistant provost, I participated in all these meetings, which included:

- C5.P9 • University Faculty Meeting (December 1)
- C5.P10 • Undergraduate Student Council Open Forum (December 1)
- C5.P11 • Staff Open Forum (December 4)
- C5.P12 • Academic Priorities Committee (December 8)
- C5.P13 • Faculty Forum (December 9)
- C5.P14 • Faculty of Color Group (December 10)
- C5.P15 • Concerned Graduate Students of Color and Allies (December 11)
- C5.P16 • Department Chairs and Center Directors Meeting (December 14)
- C5.P17 • Administrative Leadership Group (December 18)

C5.P18 Hundreds of people attended each of the faculty, student, and staff open meetings and the discussion was often spirited and contentious.

C5.P19 As a result of this feedback process, the assistant provost and I spent the second half of January redrafting the DIAP and writing up two memos that tabulated, categorized, and responded to all the feedback we received from the different sources and venues in order to demonstrate to the community that we had actually read/heard the feedback and were integrating much of it into the final draft of the plan (see appendix B for a summary of the community feedback). Before releasing the final plan, we shared the penultimate draft with the university president, all the senior deans and vice presidents, the Faculty of Color group, the Concerned Graduate Students of Color group, and key faculty members, staff leaders, and alumni. My chief of staff, the assistant provost, and I met with several of these groups to gather one more round of edits and feedback. The final draft of the DIAP was released on February 1, 2016. The Brown University Corporation voted to endorse the plan, *Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion: An Action Plan for Brown*, on February 6, 2016.

C5.P20 Since then, we have been busy implementing the plan. The early results are promising: during the 2015–16 academic year, one-third of all faculty hired at Brown were from historically underrepresented groups. During the 2016–17 academic year, this number grew to 41 percent of all new faculty hires. The number of HUG students matriculating in our graduate programs has doubled over the last two years. New programs aimed at building the pipeline of HUG faculty and students have also been launched. These include new and expanded outreach programs to HUG undergraduate and graduate applicants, the expansion of a high-touch graduate training program in the biomedical and physical sciences, the expansion of the Target of Opportunity (TOO) faculty hiring program, the launch of a postdoctoral

fellowship program and senior visiting scholar program aimed at attracting both young and established HUG scholars to Brown, and the creation of a Faculty of Color Mentoring Network. We have also established a new center for first-generation/low-income students and a new initiative focused on Native American and Indigenous Studies. Promoting these changes required much effort and time by many people (faculty, staff, students, and administrators) throughout the university, and we still have much work to do in the coming years. Looking ahead, we must be vigilant against complacency in order to guarantee that the current DIAP not become yet another promising but ultimately unsuccessful diversity plan, to be added to the long list of other past plans.

C5.P21 In what follows, I describe two features of the process that highlight the importance of deliberation in crafting Brown's DIAP: the role of deliberative fora in working through controversial proposals in the draft DIAP, and the deliberative/experimentalist process through which all academic departments developed their own diversity and inclusion plans.

C5.S4

5.4 CRAFTING THE UNIVERSITY-WIDE PLAN: THE ROLE OF DELIBERATIVE FORA

C5.P22 I have listed the various meetings and community open fora that were organized to explain the specific proposals of the DIAP and solicit feedback. At these various meetings, as well as in the feedback we received online and through email, two issues—faculty hiring and training/professional development—emerged as especially polarizing within the Brown community. The role of deliberation in these open community meetings was key to airing and debating competing views on these goals and arriving at new proposals that all participants in these fora could embrace.

C5.P23 In the original draft of the DIAP, the university committed to doubling the number of tenure-track faculty from historically underrepresented groups by 2024–25. This amounted to an increase of about 60 HUG faculty members over ten years. The draft was somewhat vague on how we hoped to achieve this goal, but listed various programs (i.e., new endowed professorships, Target of Opportunity programs, cluster hiring, pipeline programs, etc.) that we planned to employ to recruit these new members of the faculty. This goal provoked starkly different reactions. Some faculty and students felt that this goal was insufficient and that we should double the percentage of HUG faculty in three to five years, not over a decade, and double it again by 2024–25. Others felt that this goal was unrealistic given the alleged paucity of HUG faculty and graduate students in various academic disciplines. And still others worried openly that the university would compromise academic excellence

and “quality” in an effort to meet its goals of diversifying the faculty. Each of these views was shared in smaller group meetings or individual emails and phone calls. They were also expressed openly in the two faculty meetings dedicated to the DIAP (which drew standing room only crowds—not the norm at regular faculty meetings).

C5.P24

These faculty meetings were organized so that all participants would be well informed about the specific proposals in the draft DIAP (everyone with a Brown email address received a copy of the plan in advance of the meeting and I opened both meetings by summarizing the key features/proposals of the plan). Members of the Faculty Executive Committee (an elected body of senior faculty across the university) moderated these discussions so that all participants could speak openly about their views/concerns regarding the DIAP. Skillful moderation was key in preventing these discussions from being dominated by a small number of individuals or devolving into unconstructive debates between opposing camps of opinion. By giving individual faculty the ability to voice their views, listen to other colleagues express competing opinions and concerns, and then have the provost and president present them with details on how we imagined the Target of Opportunity and pipeline programs would work at Brown, most (but not all) these individual faculty were able to move from their original positions to a more common view. Important in these discussions was the sharing of data and detailed examples of how diversity pipeline and hiring programs actually work. The president, vice president for diversity and inclusion, and I shared with attendees at these meetings some basic data from various minority professional associations, the Mellon Mays Undergraduate Fellows program, and our own nascent pipeline programs to show that we could—with effort and focus—meet our goals. We also realized that the goal of doubling the number of HUG faculty in ten years was not an especially ambitious target. As a result of the deliberative process that took place at these meetings, a new proposal emerged in which the university would commit to double the number of HUG faculty in five to seven years and would work closely with the individual departments and schools to develop customized Target of Opportunity programs, postdoctoral fellow programs and other pipeline efforts. This proposal was ultimately embraced by just about all faculty, including the original critics.

C5.P25

Through our discussions and the presentation of data, we were able to show the skeptics that we could, with targeted efforts, achieve our goal without in any way compromising our academic standards. In fact, out of this process (airing of competing views, the presentation of data and detailed examples, and deliberation) a new narrative developed. This new narrative revolved around the idea that Brown’s pathway to academic excellence and distinction would occur through the university’s DIAP and not in spite of it. In other words, if we could deliver on our goals, Brown would quickly become known as *the* Ivy League university that both

promoted academic excellence and provided a diverse and inclusive community for all students, faculty, and staff. As a result, “the best and the brightest” would come to choose Brown over some of our larger, better known, and better resourced peers and a virtuous cycle of diversity, inclusion, and academic excellence/distinctiveness would follow. I have since popularized this new narrative. These days, when I present the university’s DIAP to various audiences, I stress that we are pursuing these goals not just because it is the “right” thing to do (aligned with the university’s mission of serving our community and nation, honoring past commitments, educating future leaders, etc.) but also because it is the “smart” thing to do (it is our pathway to distinction).

C5.P26

A second issue that generated significant disagreement within the community revolved around training/professional development. Activist undergraduate and graduate students demanded that all faculty members undergo mandatory “anti-oppression” training in order to understand and more fully appreciate the ways in which racism, power, and privilege shape the educational experience of HUG students on campus. These student groups presented a list of grievances, sometimes calling out individual professors and staff members, who they felt engaged in macro- and micro-aggressions and needed to be disciplined, if not retrained. Some members of the faculty and staff agreed with this assessment and supported the student demands. However, the majority of faculty opposed this proposal and demanded that the university protect their “academic freedom” and disciplinary expertise. They argued that our students were becoming too coddled, fixated on “trigger warnings” and classroom climate rather than on learning. And while this latter group pointed to the failure of mandatory diversity training programs in private sector/corporate settings (Dobbin and Kalev 2016), the former group argued that their proposals were simply an extension of the mandatory occupational health and safety training all people working in laboratories undergo, or even the mandatory human-subject training that most life science and social science researchers must pass before the IRB (institutional review board) permits their projects to go forward. In other words, if the university were truly serious about diversity, it would mandate anti-oppression/diversity training as well. Within the administration, we were divided. Some of us initially believed that mandatory diversity training was essential if we were to truly change some of Brown’s basic policies, practices, and culture. Others felt it would be at best a waste of effort, forcing busy people to undergo training that everyone recognized was ineffective, or even worse, an empty gesture that would get the student protesters off our backs but not really bring about any meaningful change.

C5.P27

Once again, these competing views were aired and discussed at the public meetings and presented as arguments for the common good of the university



the individual departments and centers would fall in line and hire diverse faculty, recruit diverse students to their graduate programs, and reform their curricula to provide greater attention to issues of race and ethnicity in the United States. In many ways, these documents were a combination of vision statements and compliance protocols, and thus it should come as no surprise that they produced mixed results. In my own research, I have argued that traditional compliance programs/mechanisms promote (at best) mixed outcomes, and that developing the capabilities of key actors is more effective in promoting significant and sustained organizational change (Locke 2013).

C5.P30 As a result of this reading of past plans and their mixed outcomes, and my own work on organizational change, we decided to require that all academic departments at the university (and later on, all administrative units as well) develop their own DIAPs. The theory of change implicit in this decision was that if the basic building blocks (academic departments) engaged in the same deliberative process that we promoted at the university level, chances were that we would arrive at common goals that could be embraced fully by the faculty and students. The hope was that this departmental-level deliberative process would produce a more robust set of actions and thus avoid the mistakes and missteps of the past. We also felt that given the different realities of Brown's numerous departments (the demographic composition of their faculty and students varied; their academic programs engaged issues of race and ethnicity in very different ways or not at all—imagine the differences between the Africana Studies and Applied Mathematics departments), it would be best not to impose uniform expectations/targets on all of them but, rather, have them develop their own goals and proposals for how to achieve them. In addition, we felt that it was essential that all academic units engage in department-wide (i.e., including students, staff, and faculty) discussions of these issues as a way of addressing climate issues within individual departments and (we hoped) generate buy-in for the goals of the university-wide DIAP.

C5.P31 We did not instruct the departments on what to include in their individual plans, but we did send each of them demographic data on the composition of their current faculty, staff, student concentrators, and students enrolled in their classes, as well as results from faculty searches, over the past five years. We also sent them a list of suggested topics to cover in their plan: departmental climate, hiring plans and practices, mentoring programs, curricular issues, and outreach programs. Departments could choose to include all or none of these suggested topics in their individual plans, but they did need to document the process through which their plans were developed, with a clear message that we expected the discussions/deliberations informing these departmental plans to be as inclusive as possible. We asked that all plans be delivered to the provost's office by June 1, 2016. I made it

clear (repeatedly) that I would only authorize faculty hiring/search requests from departments that had submitted approved (by me) DIAPs. To facilitate this process, the vice president for diversity and inclusion visited numerous departments and advised them on how best to structure their internal discussions and draft their plans. In addition, I used two monthly meetings (90 minutes each) of all the departmental chairs and center directors to share examples of good departmental plans and facilitate discussion among the chairs who had concerns surrounding this process and/or wanted to describe already existing departmental “best practices.”

C5.P32 By early June, my office had received 51 departmental plans. A team consisting of me, my assistant provost, the vice president of diversity and inclusion, and the deans of the Faculty, College, and Graduate School read through all the departmental plans and sent written comments/substantive feedback to each department by late July. We wanted to show the departments that we valued all the time and effort they had devoted to this process and that we had actually read their individual plans. We requested that all departments revise their plans and resubmit them to my office by early September. All departmental plans were then posted on a university website open to anyone with a Brown ID. The idea was to make these plans as transparent as possible, with the hope that this would enhance accountability. Each year, all departments are asked to update their departmental diversity and inclusion plans and post these updates on the university website dedicated to the DIAP.

C5.P33 In addition to the written feedback, over the summer I hosted a series of meetings that brought together the chairs of departments within the same cluster or division (e.g., chairs of all the humanities departments, or of all the physical science departments, or of all the social science departments). In advance of these meetings with these groups of department chairs, I shared with them each other's departmental plans and then, during our meeting, moderated a discussion focused on common challenges, best practices, and possible synergies across the different departments. These meetings lasted on average two hours and were highly productive. The internal benchmarking, open discussion, and creative thinking about cross-departmental initiatives that took place among chairs from relatively similar departments was fascinating. For example, during the meeting with the chairs of the various physical and computational science departments, plans for establishing a joint speakers series that highlighted the work of HUG scientists was developed. And department chairs borrowed innovative ideas and initiatives from one another. The Computer Science department hired a small group of HUG undergraduates to help write the department's own DIAP. This idea was subsequently copied by the other departments. As a way of attracting HUG students to their courses and concentration (major), the Applied Mathematics department created new undergraduate research opportunities for HUG students. This initiative was soon replicated

by the other physical and computational science departments. At the first meeting of all the department chairs and center directors in the new academic year (September 2016), I asked several of the chairs to share with all other department chairs/center directors some of the exciting academic programming, recruiting strategies, and hiring initiatives they had launched as a result of this process.

C5.P34

What is especially interesting about the process of developing departmental diversity and inclusion plans is how it combined both deliberation and experimentalism. The university-wide plan set broad goals and parameters on the process, but each academic unit had to figure out for itself how best to promote greater diversity and inclusion within its own community. As provost, I insisted on two things: (1) that the departmental discussions/deliberations around these plans be inclusive—include not just faculty but also students and staff; and (2) that they specify not just targets/goals but also mechanisms through which they would achieve these goals. The meetings with clusters of department chairs also allowed departments to benchmark against one another, share best practices, and discuss common challenges. This combination of central targets, departmental deliberations and self-generated proposals, and benchmarking meetings in many ways resembles the experimentalist governance processes described by Sabel and Zeitlin (2012). Most of these departmental plans included proposals to develop their internal capabilities so that they could best achieve their departmental goals.

C5.P35

Many of the departmental plans included notes from or summaries of their meetings. In my meetings with individual chairs and with clusters of chairs over the course of the summer, I asked all of them to describe the process through which their departments developed the plans. Once again, deliberation played a key role in reconciling competing views and even visions for how particular departments could become more diverse and inclusive. Discussions centered on faculty search processes, graduate student recruitment, ways of reforming their curriculum to engage more HUG students, and/or how to cover material related to issues of race and ethnicity. In some departments, students sought to change basic governance processes (i.e., participate in tenure and promotion discussions) or once again require that all faculty submit to mandatory anti-oppression training. In other departments, groups of faculty resisted all changes, claiming that the pipeline for HUG faculty and graduate students in their disciplines simply did not exist. Yet in all these departments, these contrasting views were aired and debated, new facts and arguments were brought to bear to shape the conversations, and consensus formed around a focused number of proposals that all members of the community could support.

C5.P36

For example, in most departments, students demanded that the curriculum include courses on race, ethnicity, and social justice and how these issues applied to the specific academic discipline or field. In many departments (e.g., history, American

studies, political science, economics, literature, etc.), this proposal was relatively straightforward and many of these departments were already offering or could easily offer courses with this content. Other departments (e.g., the mathematical and physical sciences) were at a loss as to how they could teach basic principles of mathematics or engineering or computer programming and engage honestly with issues of race and ethnicity in the United States. In my discussions with individual department chairs and also from reading their meeting transcripts and notes, I was able to piece together a deliberative process in which a group of students, sometimes joined by individual faculty members, would present their arguments for why it is important to engage issues of race and ethnicity in the curriculum of all departments, while some faculty would articulate an alternative argument for how the basic principles of the discipline were what needed to be taught and that issues of race, ethnicity, power, and privilege, while important, could not be “shoe-horned” into the material that is foundational to their specific disciplines. These exchanges were at times heated, but the results of these discussions and of this deliberative process were great. In all departments, new proposals emerged that could be embraced by all participants. Sometimes this did, in fact, entail new courses. One example was in the Department of Earth, Environment, and Planetary Sciences, which developed a new course on the History of Conflict Minerals as one of their introductory courses. In other cases (mathematics, applied mathematics, music, and physics), the departments designed new introductory courses and research opportunities that would attract more diverse students to their concentrations.

C5.P37 Since I explained to all faculty and students that these departmental plans would be “living/working documents” to be discussed and revised over time, departments came to understand that the conversations that they had begun in the spring of 2016 would be ongoing. That these conversations had taken place at all was a major shift in their departmental practice and culture. Although issues of race, ethnicity, power, privilege, and so on may have been raised among some faculty and students in some (limited number of) departments, never before had all departments so thoroughly engaged these issues and thought hard about how they could contribute to the university’s efforts to create a genuinely diverse and inclusive academic community.

C5.S6

5.6 GIVING VOICE TO THE (MOSTLY) SILENT (MODERATE) MAJORITY

C5.P38 The 2015–16 academic year, during which many of these events took place, was an especially tense and politically (emotionally) charged period on campus. At Brown, as in many other universities and colleges across the country, a few incidents occurred

in which individual administrators and/or faculty, and even a few outside speakers, were shouted down or called out in a very public manner. In December 2015, I experienced this first-hand when a small group of students occupied University Hall and asserted that they were not interested in listening to what a “white, cisgender man” had to say. In the spring of 2016, a very public debate between a HUG undergraduate student and his white male professor took place over the educational value of specific course readings. The professor claimed that the readings were classics in the field and should be taught. The undergraduate student argued that they were outdated and racist in their portrayal of poor, urban black family life. As a result of these and a small number of other incidents, numerous faculty and students reported that they felt nervous, at times even fearful, of speaking up in class or during public events for fear that they would unwittingly offend HUG students and/or faculty colleagues and thus be called out and criticized publicly. Some faculty members and students joined with others across the country demanding that universities protect their “free speech” and not permit “political correctness” from “censoring” more conservative voices and perspectives.

C5.P39

To address this issue, the president and I co-sponsored a new series called “Reaffirming University Values: Campus Dialogue and Discourse” to explore and model constructive and engaging ways for the campus community to discuss controversial issues and conflicting views and perspectives. During the 2016–17 academic year, we hosted ten lectures and panel discussions. Topics included freedom of speech on campus, public narrative as a leadership/communicative craft, the history of immigration policy in the United States, Islamophobia, teaching difficult topics in a politically charged environment, and the origins and implications of white nationalism. All these lectures/panel discussions attracted “sold-out” crowds and all of them involved spirited but respectful discussion and dialogue among participants. The goal of this initiative is to model constructive behavior and remind the campus community of the university’s core values of fact-based inquiry, open and respectful dialogue, and intellectual pluralism.

C5.S7

5.7 CONCLUDING CONSIDERATIONS

C5.P40

This chapter has described the process through which Brown University developed its most recent DIAP. The success of this plan will hinge on consistent monitoring and oversight at the highest levels of the university, on accountability by the entire Brown community, and on the continued engagement of a wide range of community members, including faculty, students, staff, and alumni.

C5.P41 But the experience at Brown also provides insights into how a process grounded in/guided by deliberation can transform a highly contentious climate in which competing groups of students, faculty, and staff were struggling over not just academic programming and conventional hiring and recruitment processes but also the place of different identity groups within the university community and how we treat one another fairly and respectfully. Initially, the demands by these competing groups appeared to be irreconcilable. But through a lengthy and highly participatory process in which all groups could express their concerns and demands, and discuss them with other groups who often held alternative views, we were able to move most people away from their original positions and toward a common set of proposals and actions. How these discussions were structured and moderated made all the difference in shaping the outcome of these discussions. Whether or not this process ultimately succeeds will depend on our ability to deliver on our promises. But given the increasingly complex reality of universities today and the many contentious issues that we will face in the near future (e.g., budgetary constraints due to new federal tax legislation; support for students, faculty, and staff with Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) status and those who are undocumented; protecting academic freedom and scientific research on areas such as climate change and reproductive rights in the current (post-fact) political environment, etc.), my hope is that the lessons learned at Brown might be generalizable to other universities wrestling with similar or even different contentious issues in the future.

C5.P42 Deliberation is a process that builds the necessary individual and organizational capabilities to address these complex issues in ways that strengthen (as opposed to divide) our communities. It is a way of tapping into the collective intelligence of our community to expand the range of possible solutions to the vexing problems we face. And it is a process through which we reinforce our basic values of fairness, respect for differences, and the centrality of fact, logic, and active listening to shape our decision-making. In these troubled times, we need deliberation and the values it reinforces to protect not just universities but also our fragile democracy.

C5.S8

REFERENCES

- C5.P43 Brown University Steering Committee on Slavery and Justice. (2007). *Slavery and Justice*. Providence, RI: Brown University.
- C5.P44 Cohen, Joshua. (2009). *Philosophy, Politics, Democracy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- C5.P45 Dobbin, Frank, and Alexandra Kalev. (2016). "Why Diversity Programs Fail—And What Works Better." *Harvard Business Review* 94, no. 7: 52–60.

- C5.P46 Locke, Richard. (2013). *The Promise and Limits of Private Power Promoting Labor Standards in a Global Economy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- C5.P47 Sabel, Charles F., and Jonathan Zeitlin. (2012). "Experimentalist Governance." In *The Oxford Handbook of Governance*, edited by David Levi-Faur, 169–83. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

C5.P48 APPENDIX A

C5.P49 *The Action Plan*

C5.S9 I. PEOPLE

C5.P50 Brown seeks to identify, recruit, and retain individuals from groups that have been historically underrepresented in higher education. To do this, we will:

C5.P51 1. Develop and sustain a diverse faculty at Brown, with the goal of doubling the number of tenure-track faculty from historically underrepresented groups by 2022. This amounts to an increase of at least 60 faculty members over the next five to seven years. To realize this goal, we will:

C5.P52 • **Require departments to create diversity and inclusion action plans:** Every department will submit an approved plan (approved by the Provost and Vice President of Academic Development, Diversity, and Inclusion) for diversification and inclusion before any faculty hiring requests are authorized for AY 2016-17 and for the duration of this plan. These Departmental Diversity and Inclusion Action Plans (DDIAPs) should include information about past hiring and reflect the specific steps that departments will take to identify and consider candidates from historically underrepresented groups when replacing retiring or departing faculty.

C5.P53 • **Create endowed professorships:** As part of the *BrownTogether* campaign, which aims to establish more than 100 endowed professorships over the next decade, we will create endowed professorships (both junior and senior) that will support faculty who are models of excellence in researching issues of diversity, social justice, power, and privilege around the globe. This is aligned with a number of the themes of Brown's strategic plan, *Building on Distinction*, including (but not limited to) "Creating Peaceful, Just, and Prosperous Societies," "Exploring Human Experience," "Deciphering Disease and Improving Population Health," and "Cultivating Creative Expression."

C5.P54 • **Connect with diverse early career scholars:** Brown created the Young Scholars Conference program in 2015-16 to provide small, integrative opportunities for diverse graduate and postgraduate fellows. Two conferences will be held in this and in future years, creating knowledge about and connections to a significant group of potential candidates for faculty positions.

- C5.P55

 - **Create a pipeline from postdocs to faculty:** Brown launched the Presidential Diversity Postdoctoral Fellowship Program in 2015-16 to support the development of early career scholars who add intellectual diversity to the campus, with a specific emphasis on recruiting scholars from historically underrepresented groups. Six scholars will be recruited each year (for two-year appointments) to teach in a variety of disciplines. By hosting 12 postdoctoral fellows each year, this program diversifies the teachers and academic topics to which our undergraduates are exposed, enriches the intellectual life of the campus, and serves as a mechanism by which talented early scholars can be recruited into tenure-track faculty positions at Brown. We are currently seeking grant funding that would create a direct connection of diversity postdoctoral fellowships to tenure-track positions.
- C5.P56

 - **Engage in cluster hiring:** Our efforts to diversify the faculty will be most successful if we create communities of diverse faculty who are connected by common research interests. The integrative themes highlighted in Brown's strategic plan lend themselves naturally to cluster hiring initiatives. In 2015, Brown hired an Associate Dean of the Faculty for Special Initiatives to focus on plans for diversity cluster hiring for faculty positions in the physical sciences. Based on the success of this work, we will announce parallel cluster hires in social science and the humanities by the end of 2016. We will appoint a second, permanent Associate Dean of the Faculty for Special Initiatives to continue coordinating these efforts in the social sciences and humanities.
- C5.P57

 - **Revitalize the Target of Opportunity Program:** We will use the Target of Opportunity program to identify and hire faculty of exceptional merit and promise, including members of historically underrepresented groups. Approximately 25% of newly funded incremental positions and 25% of existing slots that become vacant during the plan period will be filled through the Target of Opportunity program. Academic unit requests for consideration for Target of Opportunity hires will include a review of past hiring practices and of planning for future faculty hiring that include diversity efforts.
- C5.P58

 - **Launch a Diversity Visiting Scholars Program:** In addition to the Presidential Diversity Postdoctoral Fellowship program, aimed at recruiting junior scholars, we will launch by the end of 2016 a new Diversity Visiting Scholars program aimed at recruiting senior scholars from historically underrepresented groups to teach and conduct research on issues of race, ethnicity, and identity. These will be one-year (renewable) appointments aimed at enhancing our teaching and research programs while also serving as a possible pipeline for future faculty recruits.
- C5.P59

 - **Invest in mentoring:** To support faculty of color at Brown, we will offer mentoring opportunities that connect junior faculty with senior faculty inside and outside their individual departments. These programs have been found to have positive benefits for professional development, retention, and community building. To recognize the service of these faculty mentors, we will encourage departments to provide relief from other service obligations and/or provide research support for their scholarship. In addition, department chairs and center directors will be asked to address the additional advising and

mentoring burdens that often fall to faculty of color. The Provost's monthly meeting with department chairs and directors will highlight and diffuse best practices in these areas.

- C5.P60 • **Create faculty networks that increase success among diverse faculty:** This year, the Office of Institutional Diversity and Inclusion (OIDI) in partnership with faculty, established the Faculty of Color Network to provide social support, mentorship, and professional development for diverse faculty. We will continue this network with aspirations to collaborate with other institutions of higher learning around the state. The faculty network will launch an incoming orientation for faculty of color to introduce them to the broad network of resources available to support their research and curriculum development efforts. This will be jointly managed by the Dean of the Faculty and the Vice President for Academic Development, Diversity, and Inclusion.
- C5.P61 • **Institute professional development training for members of the Tenure, Promotions, and Appointments Committee (TPAC):** We will provide annual training on diversity and inclusion, as well as training to avoid conscious and unconscious bias for all TPAC members.
- C5.P62 • **Increase the representativeness of historically underrepresented groups among the Medical School's clinical faculty:** The Warren Alpert Medical School will work collaboratively with and monitor the affirmative action efforts of the affiliated hospitals and physician practice organizations which employ many of the School's clinical faculty.

C5.P63 We expect that many of these initiatives will lay a foundation that will promote faculty diversity well beyond the initial timeline outlined in this plan.

C5.P64 2. Diversify the graduate and medical student bodies at Brown, with the goal of doubling the number of graduate students from historically underrepresented groups by 2022, and sustaining and enhancing the successful recruiting of historically underrepresented groups in medicine. To do this, we will:

- C5.P65 • **Expand graduate fellowships:** We will create 25 new graduate fellowships over the next five years to enhance the diversity of Ph.D. students. These will be granted in addition to current departmental allotments by the Dean of Graduate School.
- C5.P66 • **Invest in enhanced graduate education:** We will expand programs, such as the successful National Institutes of Health-funded Initiative for Maximizing Student Development (IMSD) program, which has led to increases in graduate student diversity in the Division of Biology and Medicine, the School of Public Health, and the Life Sciences, to other Ph.D. programs throughout the University. Such programs will provide additional research training, support, and mentoring for graduate students from historically underrepresented groups. The Provost has already allocated seed funding to jump-start these efforts for this year. We anticipate applying for foundation and/or federal funding to support this work.
- C5.P67 • **Develop research opportunities for aspiring Ph.D. students:** Brown has been a hub for promoting the academic development of HUG undergraduates through the Leadership

Alliance Consortium and the Brown-Tougaloo Partnership. To expand these efforts, we will develop a relationship with a Hispanic Serving Institution to launch a partnership in summer 2017. We will also explore the possibility of expanding the Tougaloo partnership. These programs will bring undergraduate students to Brown to engage in research and learning opportunities that prepare them to be competitive for admission into Brown's graduate programs.

C5.P68

- **Develop residential summer seminars for aspiring Ph.D. students:** We will fund departments to enable them to run summer immersion programs, which provide a two-week summer residential program with intensive coursework and mentoring to help undergraduate students from underrepresented groups aspiring to enter Ph.D. programs. This program was successfully piloted at Brown in summer 2015 and will be expanded to more departments. Interested departments may request funds to support this effort as part of their Departmental Diversity and Inclusion Action Plans (DDIAPs).

C5.P69

- **Increase diversity in the Warren Alpert Medical School and affiliated residency programs:** The Medical School will grow its diverse student body by building on the successful recruitment efforts of all of its current admission pathways. This includes the Program in Liberal Medical Education (PMLE) and the Early Identification Program, as well as post-baccalaureate and standard admissions. Through the Office of Diversity and Multicultural Affairs (ODMA), we will direct recruitment efforts to students of historically black colleges and universities as well as Hispanic-serving institutions. The ODMA will continue its successful collaboration with the Brown Minority Housestaff Association (BMHA) to provide mentorship and role models for students, and collaboration in recruitment efforts across affiliated residency programs. These efforts recognize that many residents transition to junior faculty positions upon graduation. In order to encourage diversity in residency training, the medical school will review social, cultural, and other barriers that may discourage members of historically underrepresented groups from participating in area residency programs. The medical school will also seek to develop new pipeline programs to identify and prepare underrepresented students for careers in medicine, including the Pathways to Medicine Program aimed at preparing academically disadvantaged students for medical school admission.

C5.P70

- **Hire staff who are dedicated to recruiting diverse graduate students:** The Graduate School has recently hired a new full-time assistant dean tasked with developing a strategic recruitment plan in collaboration with all graduate programs. This strategic recruitment plan will identify and target promising students for Brown's doctoral and masters programs. The Warren Alpert Medical School is also filling a similar position to oversee its diversity efforts.

C5.P71

3. Enhance diversity among our undergraduates with a specific focus on African American/Black, Latinx, Native American, Southeast Asian, Pacific Islander, first-generation, low-income, and undocumented students:

C5.P72

- **Expand partnerships with organizations that promote opportunities for high school students of color:** Partnerships with organizations that provide talented high school students with mentoring and other assistance with college preparation are increasingly important to identifying and recruiting diverse undergraduates. An example is College Horizons, a program for Native American, Alaskan Native, and Native Hawaiian students that includes a summer component, which Brown will host in summer 2016. In addition, the large summer programs at Brown have established relationships with more than 40 partnership organizations across the country and bring hundreds of students to campus each summer with their help. We will expand this effort, funding more students from current partners and seeking additional partners across the country to increase the number of students from historically underrepresented groups.

C5.P73

- **Expand resources for A Day on College Hill (ADOCH):** We will double the current funding to bring low-income students from diverse backgrounds to attend ADOCH, Brown's annual spring recruiting program for admitted students. We will do this through greater financial assistance for travel and more intensive recruiting by alumni and current students. We will also expand resources for low-income students to bring a parent or guardian with them for the school visit.

C5.P74

- **Increase aid funding, enrollment, and programming to encourage growth in diversity in Summer@Brown:** This program brings thousands of high school students to campus each summer to take college-level and college-exploration courses. We will expand existing efforts to recruit a diverse student population from across the nation and increase programmatic support for first-generation and other diverse student populations who attend Summer@Brown. Curricular and co-curricular programming will incorporate awareness and focus on diversity in order to serve both minority and majority populations in enhanced learning opportunities. These programs offer an opportunity for faculty and graduate students to pilot new courses and curricular components arising from OIDI seed funding and encouragement from the DoC curriculum committee (see more in "Curriculum" below).

C5.P75

4. Promote hiring practices, professional development, and mentorship programs that will increase the diversity of staff and further their careers, especially staff from historically underrepresented groups. University Human Resources (HR) will:

C5.P76

- **Improve communications about hiring practices and professional development:** We will establish a working group to identify ways to improve communication to the Brown community about existing hiring practices, career pathways, and professional development programs, including the sessions and courses currently offered on-site by the Center for Learning and Professional Development and the opportunities for financial assistance provided through the Employee Education Program to take degree courses at Brown and other degree-granting institutions.

- C5.P77 • **Improve communication with hiring managers regarding Brown's Affirmative Action Plans:** These annual plans include goals to recruit minorities, women, veterans, and individuals with disabilities. HR will sustain training and support to hiring managers regarding their role in supporting these plans.
- C5.P78 • **Develop a pipeline of diverse temporary employees from the local community:** We will require the preferred temporary staffing agencies that Brown uses to build a workforce development program aimed at developing a more diverse pipeline of qualified local applicants for temporary and permanent positions at Brown.
- C5.P79 • **Pilot an Administrative Fellows Program:** The goal of this program will be to attract talented professionals from historically underrepresented groups to leadership positions in higher education by offering 12-month work assignments at Brown, complemented by a professional development seminar series. This program may include Visiting Fellows (those who would come from outside Brown) and/or Resident Fellows (those currently employed at Brown).
- C5.P80 • **Expand Brown's staff mentoring program:** We will expand the program launched for new employees in 2015 that pairs entry- to mid-level employees with higher-level employees in a mentoring relationship with a goal of fostering professional development and career growth at Brown.
- C5.P81 • **Continue implementation of the Leadership Certification Program:** Launched in 2015, this program requires leadership certification for all newly hired and promoted managers in grades 9 through 12. These employees must complete a series of modules designed to enhance management skills in a variety of areas, including hiring and developing staff, valuing differences, and managing performance.

C5.S10

II. ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE

C5.P82 Academic excellence in the context of diversity and inclusion means three things: (1) creating a learning environment in which students from all backgrounds—defined according to race, ethnicity, nationality, income, first-generation status, gender identity, sexual orientation, disability status, veteran status, religious and political views, and other characteristics—can thrive in their chosen fields of study; (2) providing scholarly resources to support education and leading-edge research on issues of diversity, social justice, power, and privilege around the globe, both in the present and throughout history, especially for those departments that have long been committed to promoting this work; and (3) sustaining the University's longstanding commitment to the highest standards of research and teaching while leveraging scholarly resources to grow the University's national and global imprint as a standard-bearer of academic excellence. The actions outlined here will further these goals.

C5.P83 To strengthen the broader learning environment, we will:

- C5.P84

• **Expand the Center for the Study of Race and Ethnicity in America (CSREA) and the Center for the Study of Slavery and Justice (CSSJ):** These centers are already vital sources of interdisciplinary scholarship on issues related to structural racism and social justice. CSREA was established in 1986 as one of the nation's earliest academic centers devoted to race and ethnicity. CSSJ was established in 2012-13 in response to a recommendation from the report of the Steering Committee on Slavery and Justice. Both engage faculty and students from a wide range of departments across campus. Both have already been identified as priorities for fundraising in Brown's comprehensive campaign, with the goal of raising \$10 million for each. Within the next year, CSREA will be relocated to a larger space at the center of campus.
- C5.P85

• **Launch a Native American and Indigenous Peoples Initiative:** Brown has extensive scholarly resources in Native and Indigenous studies in such departments as American and Ethnic Studies, History, and Anthropology, as well as in the Haffenreffer Museum, the John Carter Brown Library, and the John Hay Library. To build on these resources and recruit new faculty and postdocs who work on Native and Indigenous issues, we will work to become the academic leader in this area. A planning committee, coordinated by the Office of the Provost, has begun planning this initiative and expects to have an initial set of proposals by the end of the spring 2016 semester. As a part of this initiative, we intend to develop a Native American student program.
- C5.P86

• **Incorporate issues of race, ethnicity, racialization, immigration, and identity into the integrative themes:** We will ask academic leaders of the integrative themes discussed in the University's strategic plan and accompanying operational plan to ensure that their research and teaching programs include components related to these core issues in ways that are appropriate to the subject matter.
- C5.P87

• **Assess hiring needs in alignment with teaching demands:** To meet the demand for courses and for advising on race, ethnicity, power, privilege, and identity in contemporary and historical contexts, we will support requests for faculty hiring in these areas, including incremental growth positions in departments that demonstrate growing demand. Brown already has a well-established process to solicit and evaluate faculty-hiring requests every spring. This process will guide all future requests for faculty hiring and growth of departmental faculty rosters.
- C5.P88

• **Support other centers of scholarship:** The University will support other research centers—such as the Cogut Center for the Humanities, the Pembroke Center for Teaching and Research on Women, the Population Studies and Training Center, the Political Theory Project, and the Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs—as they develop plans to strengthen scholarship on race, ethnicity, and immigration; sustain an academic environment that values intellectual pluralism; and increase the diversity of backgrounds, experiences and views of their faculty and postdoctoral fellow cohorts. Many of these centers are already included in *BrownTogether*, Brown's comprehensive campaign.

C5.P89

C5.SII

C5.P90

C5.P9I

C5.P92

C5.P93

C5.P94

- C5.P95 • **Provide seed funding for curriculum development:** OIDI will provide seed funding to support critical scholarship and curriculum development on race, ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, disability status, inequality, and other related areas of inquiry.

C5.Sta

IV. COMMUNITY

C5.P96 Members of our community must be free from the experience or threat of harassment and intimidation on the basis of race, class, ethnicity, sexual orientation, political orientation, nationality, religion, veteran status, gender identity, or disability status. However, we aspire to do more than assure merely this. We aim to create a community that works actively to counteract inequity and injustice and that promotes, among all our students, an attitude of mutual respect for the uncomfortable, uneven history we all share.

C5.P97 To accomplish this, we will:

- C5.P98 • **Establish a center for first-generation students:** Student advocacy and initiatives over the past few years have culminated in work by the Dean of the College during fall 2015 to create a new center that will provide first-generation students with coordinated access to resources and serve as a home for student-led initiatives. We will hire a graduate student coordinator in spring 2016 to oversee the center under the supervision of the Office of the Dean of the College and the Office of Campus Life. The new center will be located in the renovated Sciences Library and is scheduled to open in summer 2016.

- C5.P99 • **Support critical living and learning expenses for low-income undergraduate students:** Even with financial aid, many low-income domestic and international students require additional financial assistance for such essentials as health insurance, trips home for family emergencies, laptops, and books, and access to dining and housing for those who remain on campus during school breaks. By the beginning of the 2016-17 academic year, we will double the amount of funding available through the Office of Campus Life's Emergency Fund, extend dining opportunities during breaks, provide all students in need with access to health insurance, and, by the end of the academic year 2015-16, hire a full-time dean dedicated to working with and supporting first-generation and low-income undergraduate and graduate students.

- C5.P100 • **Improve mental health services:** Low-income undergraduate and graduate students and students who cannot turn to their families to fund private sessions with a therapist or psychologist should not be left without options for mental health services. In addition to increased funding available through the Office of Campus Life's Emergency Fund for ongoing care in the community, Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) will eliminate the restriction to seven appointments by the 2017-18 academic year. To meet existing student needs, the University has already increased the number of CAPS professionals.

This increase in CAPS staff, plus other changes in current practices, should eliminate wait time for appointments. In collaboration with our hospital and physician group partners, the University is also exploring additional options for providing cost-effective community mental health services for our students.

-

Professional development opportunities for this spring are listed in Appendix C. Where appropriate, lecture and presentations will be videotaped and made available to the public online and advertised to alumni and members of the Brown Corporation.

C5.P105

- **Establish a Diversity and Inclusion Collective:** The Office of Institutional Diversity and Inclusion (OIDI) will coordinate the development and implementation of professional development programs. To build in-house capacity to meet the demands for professional development, OIDI will develop the Brown University Diversity and Inclusion Professional Development Collective (D&I Collective). The D&I Collective will be an in-house group of administrators, staff, faculty, and student employees who will serve both as trainers and consultants. We will provide support in the form of postdoctoral fellowships, graduate fellowships, and undergraduate assistantships, and we will also provide “release time” for staff members with this expertise so they can participate without adding this additional work to their existing responsibilities.

C5.P106

- **Focus on training for the Department of Public Safety:** We will pay special attention to the ongoing training of members of the Department of Public Safety. The role of this department in protecting the safety and security of the campus is vitally important. The Department, which is nationally accredited, has made concerted and successful efforts to diversify its members at all levels, and all its officers participate in intensive, annual, and mandatory training on a wide variety of topics, including diversity and inclusion. The Department is equally committed toward continuous improvement. Toward that end the Department will work intensively this spring with OIDI leadership and others to assess and improve the diversity and sensitivity training for all officers. Additionally, the Public Safety Oversight Committee, a standing committee of students, faculty, and staff, is charged with overseeing the Department’s policies and practices. This committee is currently engaged in an assessment to review current policies and training practices—including practices that have raised concerns among some members of the community. These assessments will be completed this 2015-16 academic year. The Department will enhance its community outreach and community relations program by appointing a Community Liaison Officer to work directly with students and other community members to help resolve concerns about campus safety and the Department.

C5.P107

- **Promote the University’s positive impact on Providence and the surrounding region:** The University is significantly engaged in the local community through programming offered by several centers and departments at the University, as well as through the Medical School and the School of Public Health. We will broaden awareness of efforts being undertaken through such Brown centers and institutes as the Swearer Center for Public Service, the Annenberg Institute for School Reform, and the John Nicholas Brown Center for Public Humanities, and through the summer pre-college programs offered by the School of Professional Studies. A number of these programs are described in Appendix G.

- C5.P108

V. KNOWLEDGE

C5.P109

- C5.Р110

- C5.P111

VI. ACCOUNTABILITY

C5.P112

- C5.P113

C5.P114

C₅P₁₁₅

C5.P116

C5.P117

Inclusion Action Plan (DIAP); and will communicate this progress to the Brown community through written materials and forums. The Corporation will review the DIOB's report annually. Appendix E outlines the governance structure and oversight responsibilities of the DIOB.

- C5.P118 • **Expand resources for the Office of Institutional Diversity and Inclusion:** The University has allocated funding for a new position in OIDI. This Director of University Inclusion Programs will assist in the development of departmental diversity action plans and other programs described in this report. The Director will also facilitate the work of creating inclusive practices in faculty hiring, curricular development, pedagogy, mentoring and support, and community engagement. This new director position is in addition to the postdoctoral fellow, the graduate student fellows, and the undergraduate interns described previously in this plan. This additional staffing will enhance the capacity of the OIDI to fulfill its mission.

C5.S15

CONCLUSION

- C5.P119 This plan recognizes that success in creating a diverse and inclusive Brown calls on the entire campus community to contribute to creating a successful academic community that embodies the social and intellectual diversity of the world. This is central to the University's aspirations for achieving the highest level of academic excellence. The actions in this plan will help Brown fulfill its promise.

- C5.P120 However, the actions above represent only the latest efforts in Brown's commitment to fostering an inclusive and safe environment for all members of our community. Brown already has in place a set of policies and processes to investigate and address incidents of harassment and intimidation.¹ Hostile actions toward any members of our community, irrespective of their race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, socio-economic background, and gender identity, will not be tolerated. Brown is committed to the thorough, fair, and transparent enforcement of these policies and processes.

C5.P121

NOTE

- C5.S16 ¹ These policies and processes can be found at: <https://www.brown.edu/about/administration/institutional-diversity/reports-and-policies>.

C5.P123

AU: please
ck URL to
be sure it is
reproduced
accurately; or,
perhaps URL
is no longer
available?
Please advise

APPENDIX B

Summary of Community Input

1. INTRODUCTION

C5.N

On November 19, 2015, President Christina Paxson shared with the Brown community a working draft of *Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion: An Action Plan for Brown University* (DIAP). She invited students, faculty, and staff to share their input through an online form. The online form closed on January 8, 2016, collecting a total of 162 submissions. In addition, the President,

Provost, and other senior administrators received several email responses to the plan from various groups of students, faculty, staff, and alumni, as well as from departments and numerous other individuals. In parallel to this process, senior leadership also convened a number of open forums with various community groups from within and outside the University (i.e., faculty, students, staff, and the Providence community) to solicit input and questions on the proposals outlined in the plan. This appendix to the DIAP provides a high-level summary of the feedback received through these various channels and highlights the ways in which the University addressed campus input in the revised *Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion* and the plans for its implementation. *The Campus Input section of the DIAP website has a detailed summary of input—listed in the form of proposals—shared during the feedback process.*

C5.P124

Analysis of the community's input reveals a rich, substantive conversation centered on issues of diversity and inclusion. The comments from students, staff, faculty, alumni, and members of the Providence community provided important suggestions for how to improve the working document. They also highlighted the deep commitment that members of the Brown community have to making our campus truly diverse and inclusive. Equally striking, the input and recommendations we received on the plan underscored the strong desire from members of the community, no matter their affiliation or graduation year, to engage in this important conversation and to be engaged in the process of finalizing this plan and implementing it in the months and years to come.

C5.S17

2. PROCESS SUMMARY

C5.P125

Feedback from the Brown community included 162 online submissions and 35 emails. The last section of this appendix provides an overview of the different forums and sources of written commentary that also contributed to the plan. The input came in the form of comments on, and amendments to, the draft DIAP; specific edits; requests for clarity or more explicit detail on specific aspects of the draft; and new proposals. The Office of the Provost reviewed every submission received through the channels outlined above and collected them in a data-base. Each submission was categorized into one of several thematic areas and then further refined by subcategories to identify similarities and trends. In many cases, an individual or group's comments that touched upon several points were disaggregated into multiple individual submissions. In aggregate, submissions from all sources translated into more than 720 comments, anecdotes, new proposals, and edits to the original draft.

C5.S18

3. CATEGORY SUMMARIES (IN ORDER OF FREQUENCY)

C5.P126

This section summarizes the 20 most frequent categories of feedback and shares how key proposals made in each were considered in the context of revising the DIAP. In some cases, language in the final plan was revised to reflect suggestions made by the community. In others, suggestions reflected proposals that were already addressed in the DIAP or that Brown has been working on for quite some time. These comments

remind us of our need to better communicate this work to the community. In certain cases, we received proposals, which, while important, are not within the scope of the current DIAP. The assessment of these proposals will be shared with relevant parties to ensure they are addressed in future plans. Edits on the November 19 draft and comments about implementing the DIAP are addressed in the final plan.

AQ: please
ck; is URL no
longer valid?

These edits and comments are reflected in the full list of all proposals posted on the Campus Input section of the DIAP website.¹

C5.St9

Support Services for Students (125 comments)

C5.P127

The largest number of comments focused on the needs of different groups of students within the Brown community. The feedback highlighted the challenges facing international, first-generation, refugee, and undocumented students who struggle to overcome cultural, economic, linguistic, and academic barriers in unfamiliar settings. They also highlighted the difficulties these students often face when trying to understand financial aid, health insurance, or other basic support services. Comments from graduate and medical students focused on the pressures of balancing family life and childcare with the demands of coursework, lab work, and research. Faculty noted that many graduate students, especially those studying in STEM fields (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics), need additional tutoring and advising, which can add to an already crushing workload.

C5.P128

Undergraduate and graduate students from historically underrepresented groups face many of these same challenges while experiencing trauma from repeated discrimination and a lack of awareness by fellow students, faculty, and staff at Brown. These students reported that forms of oppression they face can negatively affect their grades, campus engagement, and health and wellness. Numerous comments also spoke to the distinct needs of students with disabilities or with veteran status, or those who arrive on campus from low-income backgrounds or from different religions and cultures. What became clear from this feedback is that, while many support services for these different groups of students already exist at Brown, they are not sufficient. Requests for more resources, through increased funding and additional staff, to better meet the needs of our diverse student community, were a frequent theme among the comments we received.

C5.P129

The November 19, 2015, draft of the DIAP began to address these needs through investments in such key identity centers as the Brown Center for Students of Color (BCSC), the LGBTQ Center, and the Sarah Doyle Women's Center. The final Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion plan expands this support to Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) and to mentoring programs for undergraduate and graduate students across the University. Brown is already launching a First Generation

Center to promote greater on-campus support and programming for this community, as well as an International Advisory Board—comprising senior administrators, faculty, staff, and students—to address the needs of international students, staff, and visitors to our campus. This year, we have also invested significant resources in providing both greater support services for low-income students and greater benefits for graduate students. The University will also invest in resources that engage our alumni to provide mentorship and professional-development opportunities in the form of internships and jobs. These important investments will seek to address many of the challenges outlined above.

C5.P130 To move this work forward, the new Vice President for Campus Life and Student Services will, in consultation with students and staff, conduct an assessment of needs and resources across all these centers during the summer and fall of 2016. Based on this assessment, the University will determine what additional resources are required and where they should be located to best support our student community.

C5.S20

Faculty Hiring and Departmental DIAPs (98 comments)

C5.P131

Members of the Brown community contributed significant input in the form of questions, comments, and new proposals to improve hiring practices, accelerate the timeline for doubling faculty from historically underrepresented groups, develop a more expansive view of faculty diversity, and provide better mechanisms to address pipeline and retention issues. Calls to engage students (both undergraduates and graduates) in faculty hiring committees emphasized making the hiring process more transparent and engaging these important stakeholders more directly in the process of identifying their future teachers, advisors, and mentors. Departments asked for administrative guidance and support, perhaps through the Office of the Dean of the Faculty, to coordinate cluster hires across departments and across disciplines. There were several suggestions to improve the pipeline of faculty from Historically Underrepresented Groups (HUGs), including the use of the Target of Opportunity program to hire faculty members at the associate, assistant, and research professor ranks, and to leverage post-doctoral positions for hires into tenure track positions.

C5.P132

Reflecting a broader conversation on how we define diversity and inclusion, students and faculty alike called for faculty hires that reflect the racial, ethnic, disability status, gender, sexual orientation, and intellectual pluralism Brown hopes to achieve through the implementation of the DIAP. Echoing this ambition were calls to hire more diverse faculty in STEM fields, in the Alpert Medical School, in the School of Public Health, and across departments at Brown. This was in addition to proposals to hire faculty specifically in Africana Studies, Disability Studies, Environmental Studies, South Asian Studies, Middle East/South West Asia and

C5.P133

C5.P134

C5.S21

C5.P135

osb-273019904951/6&f.pdf&of=xmi_for_typesetting

C5.PI36

C5.P137

C5.P138

C5.S22

C5.P139

inclusion that acknowledges the identities of members of our community defined by race, ethnicity, religious beliefs, ideological views, gender, sexual orientation, disability status, veteran-status, and income. Staff members and student athletes wrote and asked to be represented in the plan. They expressed often feeling invisible and isolated from campus life. In a separate but related category of comments, members of the community provided important suggestions for how we define and use terms like “HUGs,” “minority,” “underrepresented minority,” “students of color,” etc. Whether to include Asians (and subgroups within the Asian population at Brown), SWANA students, indigenous and native students—or even veteran-status, disability status, and religious identity students—within these categories raises important considerations about whom we include and how we count them in our efforts to promote greater diversity and inclusion.

C5.P140 A related set of comments called for disaggregated data on many of these groups (Asian Americans being a frequent reference) among students, staff, and faculty. Students expressed interest in being involved in the collection and analyses of these data in order to tap into their expertise and promote greater transparency and standards in data collection and reporting. While reporting and accreditation bodies regulate much of the data we currently collect, we agree that collecting more detailed data in parallel will help with the target setting, support mechanisms, and policies outlined in the plan.

C5.P141 Finally, proposals related to the admissions process at Brown offered an alternative pathway to making the campus more inclusive. Community feedback called for pipeline programs and funding to increase matriculation of undocumented, low-income, first-generation, minority, and local Providence applicants to Brown. To create pipelines into advanced graduate study, and propel more students of color into doctoral programs, several proposals called for increasing student fellowships for terminal masters programs. Comments from the medical school community focused on adapting such existing matriculation pathways as the Program in Liberal Medical Education (PLME), the post-baccalaureate linkage programs, and the early identification programs to target underrepresented groups.

C5.P142 The proposals outlined in both the original and revised DIAP underscore the importance of making the campus as inclusive as possible to all students, faculty, and staff regardless of race, ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, religion, veteran status, political orientation, socio-economic class, or disability status. Investing in identity centers to allow them to provide greater support services will help to move this work forward. Similarly, we will work with existing centers and programs across the University to ensure that *every* member of the community is in the best position to succeed. At the same time, we place heavy emphasis in this plan on recruiting those who self-identify as American Indian, Alaskan Native, African American,

Hispanic or Latinx, and Native Hawaiian and/or Pacific Islander. These groups, identified in this document as Historically Underrepresented Groups (HUGs), as well as women in STEM and Asian American and Pacific Islanders (AAPI) in the humanities and social sciences, have been identified by the U.S. Department of Education as groups that continue to have limited participation at the graduate and faculty levels at colleges and universities.

C5.P143 To promote this work at the graduate level, the DIAP includes plans to create 25 new graduate student fellowships; direct more resources, including staff, to support research, training, and mentoring for HUG graduate students; and create research opportunities to attract undergraduates from HUGs to pursue advanced graduate study. For undergraduates, we will increase funding for such important programs as *Summer@Brown* and *A Day on College Hill* (ADOCH), among other initiatives outlined in the revised plan. Finally, as outlined in the revised plan, we will establish an independent data committee within OIDI to track progress on this work over time. As we make progress on these fronts, we hope, and expect, to refocus our strategy to recruit other groups in an effort to continually make Brown more diverse and inclusive.

C5.S23

Professional Development/Training (46 comments)

C5.P144

The need for professional development/training programs to promote cultural competency and foster a safe learning environment for all students, staff, faculty, and administrators at Brown, particularly those with marginalized identities, was an important area of focus in the feedback we received. Comments on training primarily focused on two dimensions: 1) whether professional training should be mandatory or voluntary; and 2) what substantive material should be included in these training modules. For example, numerous proposals highlighted the importance of establishing training modules based on an intersectional, anti-oppression framework that recognizes various forms of diversity and identity (such as racial identity, gender identity, sexual orientation, class, disability status, and religious identity). There were also numerous calls for more resources to help departments, staff, faculty, and students prepare these professional development programs.

C5.P145

To address this feedback, the University will provide a menu of professional development opportunities that will not only build on our existing expertise and resources, but that will also significantly expand our efforts to offer these programs and activities to all members of our community. Professional development offerings for the spring of 2016 are outlined in Appendix C. In keeping with the importance of an open curriculum and unfettered scholarly inquiry to Brown's culture, the array of lectures, workshops, discussions, and activities will not be mandated but rather

AQ: there is no appendix C, etc. Include a prefatory note to that effect?

will be offered broadly and regularly so that everyone will have an opportunity to participate in these activities at many different levels. Extensive research on mandatory versus voluntary “diversity training” indicates that voluntary opportunities have been found to be more effective in promoting diversity and inclusion. That said, the final Pathways to Diversity and Inclusion plan is responsive to proposals that Brown should identify key groups that should be the focus of training. The plan provides specificity about how the professional development will be offered to students, faculty, staff and senior administrators. It is our hope that all members of our community will participate in one or more of these professional development activities.

C5.P146 The Office of Institutional Diversity and Inclusion (OIDI) will provide overall coordination for the development and implementation of programs, workshops, tools, resources, and other related support materials. The DIAP outlines how OIDI will build capacity to meet the demands for professional development with the creation of the Brown University Diversity and Inclusion Professional Development Collective (D&I Collective). The D&I Collective will be an in-house group of consultants who will serve both as master trainers and consultants and who will also review and assess programs, resources, and other materials. For example, we will provide funding for one postdoctoral fellow, three graduate fellowships, and three undergraduate student assistantships. We will also provide “release time” for staff members with this expertise so that they can participate in these modules without adding this additional work to their existing responsibilities.

C5.S24

Improving Accountability and Responsiveness (44 comments)

C5.P147 Feedback from the community also included a number of proposals to promote a campus climate of responsiveness, transparency, and accountability. Many comments called for greater transparency and engagement in the development of the plan and departmental DDIAPs. Others raised the possibility of implementing criteria and metrics to assess faculty members’ history of service, mentorship, and/or scholarship on race, social justice, diversity, and inclusion for tenure/promotion review. There were also calls for clearer mechanisms to allow students, staff, and faculty to file diversity-and-inclusion-related grievances and receive a timely response. Possible avenues for this could be a centralized administrative office or a formal Title VI Office. Wanting to be engaged in the main activities of the University, students in particular repeatedly expressed a desire to create student-elected positions on the Corporation, to have regular meetings with the University Chancellor, and to form a body of graduate student representatives to serve on the Diversity & Inclusion Oversight Board (DIOB).

To address these issues, the Diversity and Inclusion Oversight Board (DIOB) will be formed in spring 2016. This board will be charged with reviewing annually the progress of departments and schools on their DIAPs; reviewing data on diversity and inclusion, as well as making recommendations on changes in data collection to the President and Provost; preparing a public annual report on the quantitative and qualitative progress of the Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan that will be reviewed annually by the Brown Corporation; and communicating this progress to the Brown community through written materials and forums. Appendix E of the DIAP provides details on the governance and oversight responsibilities of the DIOB. It includes an explanation of efforts to strengthen accountability for diversity and inclusion initiatives by forming a small group of senior administrators who have ultimate responsibility for the implementation and success of the DIAP. This group will consist of the President, the Provost, the chair of the FEC, the VP for Campus Life and Student Services, the VP for Finance and Administration, the Dean of the Faculty, the Dean of the College, and the VP for Diversity and Inclusion. The DIAP commits OIDI to providing clear language on its Web page on how faculty, students, and staff should report potential Title VI violations. We will assess over the course of this year whether Title VI oversight should be consolidated under OIDI.

Community Engagement (33 comments)

Brown's relationship with the Providence and Rhode Island communities—particularly with communities of color—emerged as a concern throughout the feedback period. A range of ideas proposed strengthening community engagement and promoting positive impact. Several suggestions called for Brown to invest in the local community through educational programs and resources that enhance K-12 education, or by developing programs that offer internships and employment opportunities for local residents. The feedback received through this process is instructive about the need to both communicate better what is in place and to have a process for assessing, strengthening, and expanding these programs and their effects.

Brown is already engaged in much of this work through the Swearer Center for Public Service, the Center for Public Humanities, and the Annenberg Institute for School Reform. Appendix G in the DIAP addresses the campus' interest in ensuring that Brown is developing opportunities for community members in Providence to partner with members of the Brown community. It provides a detailed list of community-facing programs—Building Futures, Fund for the Education of the Children of Providence, Urban Education Fellows, College Advising Corps and TRI-Lab, to name a sampling—to address local challenges and strengthen the educational, economic, and social assets of our city, state, and region.

Cs.PISI

C5.S26

Cs.P152

Cs.P153

C5.S27

C5.P154

our students, faculty, staff, and alumni, as well as with the Providence community, to realize the important goals that we have set forth.

C5.S28

Community Forums & Group Feedback

C5.P155 Feedback from the Brown community of students, faculty, staff, and alumni resulted in 162 online submissions, 35 emails, and spirited discussions from the following forums with various community groups, including:

- C5.P156 • Faculty Meeting (December 1), 200 attendees
- C5.P157 • Undergraduate Council of Students Open Forum (December 1), 220+ attendees
- C5.P158 • Staff Open Forum (December 4), 200+ attendees
- C5.P159 • Academic Priorities Council (December 8)
- C5.P160 • Faculty Forum (December 9), 220 attendees
- C5.P161 • Faculty of Color Group (December 10)
- C5.P162 • Concerned Graduate Students of Color (CGSOC) Meeting (December 11)
- C5.P163 • Chairs and Center Directors Meeting (December 14)
- C5.P164 • Community Forum, hosted by Swearer Center (December 14)
- C5.P165 • Community Forum, hosted by the Swearer Center for Public Service, for local organizations working in areas such as education, community development, arts, disabilities, criminal justice, homelessness and health, and representatives from several agencies.
- C5.P166 • The Swearer Center also established and widely distributed an open online feedback response form to gather input on the plan from individuals and community organizations.
- C5.P167 • Administrative Leadership Group (December 18)
- C5.P168 • Dining Staff Meetings on December 22 (130 attendees) and December 23 (80 attendees)

C5.P169 In addition to feedback from individual students, faculty, staff, alumni, and Corporation members, we received written input from the following:

- C5.P170 • **Academic Departments & Schools:** Departments of Anthropology, History, Ethnic Studies; School of Public Health; Warren Alpert Medical School's Department of Psychiatry and Human Behavior; and Center for Alcohol and Addiction Studies
- C5.P171 • **Centers & Institutes:** Joukowsky Institute of Archaeology and the Ancient World, Center for Public Humanities, Swearer Center for Public Service, Annenberg Institute for School Reform, Office of the Chaplain and Religious Life
- C5.P172 • **Student Groups:** Brown Undergraduate Council of Students (UCS), Coalition of Concerned Graduate Students of Color and their Allies (CGSOC), Muslim Community & Brown Muslim Students Association, Students of the Warren Alpert Medical School, Community of People of Color ("Reading Out")

150

Richard M. Locke

- C5.P173 • **Administrative Units:** Dean of the College, Dining Services, Student and Employee Accessibility Services (SEAS)
- C5.P174 • **Faculty Groups:** Committee for Faculty Equity and Diversity (CFED)
- C5.P175 • **Alumni:** Inman Page Black Alumni Council (IPC), Asian/Asian American Alumni Alliance (A4), Brown University Latino Alumni Council (BULAC), Brown Transgender Gay and Lesbian Alumni (TBGALA)
- C5.P176 • **Providence Community:** Through the Swearer Center

NOTES

- C5.N1 1. <https://www.brown.edu/about/administration/institutional-diversity/diversity-plan>.
- C5.N2 2. A full list of proposals that were shared by the community can be found here: <https://brown.edu/web/documents/diversity/actionplan/diap-input.pdf>.