

Report of the St. Olaf Task Force on Institutional Racism

September 1, 2017

INTRODUCTION

This introduction seeks to provide some context and description of the work of the St. Olaf Task Force On Institutional Racism. It includes the following sections:

1. Why and how the Task Force was formed
2. Definitions of some key terms in our report
3. Our work during the summer of 2017
4. The format of the report
5. A description of the Title VI Working Group that we recommend to be formed to follow up on our work and recommendations, and to advise and assess the ongoing work of the College to educate about and reduce institutional racism on campus.

1. Why and how the Task Force was formed

Several incidents of hate speech and/or hate crimes occurred at St. Olaf during the 2016-2017 academic year. Particularly threatening incidents occurred in April, which led to a large-scale student protest on April 29, 2017 and a campus-wide protest and cancellation of classes on May 1, 2017. During the course of the protest on May 1, meetings and negotiations took place between members of the Collective for Change on the Hill and President Anderson and members of his President's Leadership Team (PLT).

The Task Force on Institutional Racism was officially approved by the President and the Collective on May 22, 2017 as one of the Terms and Conditions of Negotiation between President Anderson and the Collective for Change on the Hill on how to address the List of Demands made by the Collective. Details about the process, chronology and negotiations regarding the Task Force can be found on the Collective's website (<https://www.acollectiveforchangeonthehill.com>) and on the College's Diversity and Inclusion Initiative website (<https://wp.stolaf.edu/dii/>).

The events of the 2016-2017 year and of Spring 2017 in particular were very difficult for all members of the St. Olaf community, and much work will need to be done by all of us here to make it a better place for all of us, and especially for people of color and marginalized people in our community. This will include learning, listening and working together to rebuild trust and to heal wounds, as well as to establish policies and practices that will help to reduce all types of racism, discrimination and bias here, and to monitor and adjudicate violations of those policies.

Many people have been involved in these positive and constructive goals and activities, but the Collective for Change on the Hill stands out as a key organization in this

regard, and thus merits a public acknowledgment of the importance of their work. While not everyone on campus necessarily agrees with all of their positions or demands, their work was essential in bringing the campus to the necessary awareness of the need for significant work by all of us to make St. Olaf a better place. Indeed, if it had not been for the Collective, this Task Force would not have been formed, and our work would not have taken place.

2. Definitions of some key terms in our report

One of the most important terms for our work, and for the ongoing work of the College and most institutions of higher education today, is **institutional racism**. There is an extensive body of academic literature on racism and its different forms, but for our purposes we will provide only a brief definition and distinction between individual racism and institutional racism

(<https://assets.aspeninstitute.org/content/uploads/files/content/docs/rcc/RCC-Structural-Racism-Glossary.pdf>):

Individual Racism: Individual racism can include face-to-face or covert actions toward a person that intentionally express prejudice, hate or bias based on race.

Institutional Racism: Institutional racism refers to the policies and practices within and across institutions that, intentionally or not, produce outcomes that chronically favor, or put a racial group at a disadvantage.

Because it is visible and often explicit and intentional, individual racism is what most commonly gets identified as racism in US society in general. While individual racism and institutional racism are interrelated as forms of racism, we are using the term institutional racism in this report precisely to emphasize and refer to policies and practices of St. Olaf as an institution that produce outcomes that chronically favor one racial group while chronically putting others at a disadvantage.

Given how charged the term racism is for many people, it is essential to be clear that institutional racism as we discuss it here is focused on the generally unaware and unintentional ways in which policies and practices of the College disadvantage people of color in our community. That is to say, we are not stating or implying that either St. Olaf College as a whole, or the vast majority of the members of our community, are intentionally or actively racist in the individual sense of expressing prejudice, hate or bias based on race.

Our goal here is to help us all better identify, understand and reduce the ways in which we as an institution unintentionally disadvantage people of color. We hope that the demands and our recommendations about them will further clarify the difference between individual and institutional racism. The goal of this Task Force is to be constructive and positive in helping us move forward in learning about the various ways in which

institutional racism manifests itself at St. Olaf, and to work against its harmful effects on all members of our community. As an institution of higher learning, we are fortunate in this regard that learning is at the core of what we do.

3. Our work during the summer of 2017

The Task Force was constituted by the following members:

Faculty Co-Chairs: Associate Professor Joan Hepburn, Department of English;

Associate Professor Chris Chiappari, Department of Sociology/Anthropology

Students: SuSu Almousa '19, Atefeh Alavi '20, Yishu Dai '18

Alumni: Thomas Fiebiger '78, Sheridan Blanford '15

President's Leadership Team: Carl Crosby Lehmann '91, Vice President and General Counsel¹

With a few exceptions, the Task Force met weekly on Tuesday evenings from 7-9pm (the exceptions were our initial organizational meeting on May 24, the Fourth of July holiday, an additional meeting on Monday, August 28, and our final three-hour meeting on August 29). Our charge as a Task Force was:

“To consider the demands presented by the Collective for Change on the Hill and the response to those demands from the President's Leadership Team, and to make any recommendations regarding the demands by September 1, 2017.”

(<https://wp.stolaf.edu/dii/task-force/>)

We had interesting and informative discussions about the demands and the PLT responses, and various related issues. But given the charged and complex character of the issues we discussed, there were also difficult and emotional conversations along the way. We all agreed, however, that the task was important and necessary, and that the experience was very productive.

Due to time constraints and the limits of our charge, we did not meet with any individuals whose work at the College relates to any of the issues we discussed as a Task Force. Some email inquiries were made about some of the proposed policies and practices that were being considered or that were scheduled to be implemented in the fall of 2017, and we received helpful information in response. One of our overall recommendations as a Task Force is the formation of a Title VI Working Group (described below) that will follow up on these policies and practices, as well as talk with various members and stakeholders of the College to gather information about current practices, policies and needs of the College relating to these issues.

¹ Carl Crosby Lehmann has requested that his name not appear as a signatory on the final report.

As will be seen in the demands and our recommendations below, we discussed several offices or units of the College in relation to current practices and policies. The critical perspectives and perceptions of members of the Task Force and/or of other members of the community are not intended to blindly criticize any office or member of our community, but rather to express and/or raise issues, critiques and experiences that some members of the community have or have had relating to institutional racism. Our hope is that the Title VI Working Group will be able to gather relevant quantitative and qualitative data about the practices discussed and/or critiqued below. Some of the work to be funded by the To Include is to Excel grant might also be able to gather some of this relevant data.

Finally, a brief note needs to be made about the report and our timeline. We faced several challenges in our work this summer, but a constant one was time. It was a real challenge to be able to discuss all the demands and PLT responses, and as a result we scheduled additional time for meetings during the final week of August. The drafting of the report involved a significant additional amount of work, and we had a tight time frame in which to complete it. In order to have time for all of us to review and revise various drafts of the report during Week Zero of the 2017-2018 academic year, we agreed that it would be best to have an extra two days beyond our initial September 1 deadline, to review and polish our report before we released it to the College, the Collective and to the public.

4. The format of the report

The format of our report includes each demand and the PLT response to it, followed by a brief summary of our discussion and recommendation. It should be noted that the PLT responses quoted here were made in reference to an earlier draft of the List of Demands. The Collective released an updated version of the List of Demands on May 22, and that is the version that our Task Force used for our discussions and in the preparation of this report.

5. A description of the Title VI Working Group that we recommend to be formed to follow up on our work and recommendations, and to advise and assess the ongoing work of the College to educate about and reduce institutional racism on campus.

Given the scope of our task of addressing the Collective's demands and the PLT responses, and the larger and ongoing process of implementing and evaluating the various policies and practices recommended in the List of Demands (including those which the College already began to implement during summer 2017), it was clear to us from the beginning that there would need to be some entity that would follow up on our work and to continue the ongoing work of the College relating to the implementation and evaluation of the policies and practices proposed. Further research and discussion with various stakeholders in the College community, and various administrative offices and units of the College, whose work relates to the issues we discussed, is still required.

We are proposing the name of this group to be the St. Olaf Title VI Working Group. Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act is federal legislation that “prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, and national origin in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance” (<https://www.justice.gov/crt/fcs/TitleVI-Overview>). We are not wedded to this name, but it has the advantage of referring to federal legislation (like Title IX). An alternative name could be the St. Olaf Working Group on Institutional Racism.

Whatever name is ultimately chosen for this working group, what is most important about it is that it be formed in the most transparent and collaborative way possible. The group must include members of all stakeholders of the College: students (including some members of the Collective for Change on the Hill), faculty, staff, and alumni. Some experts in relevant areas should also be included in the group (as was done in the Title IX Working Group).

The proposal or nomination of its members must be made in consultation with current students (including some members of the Collective), faculty, staff and alumni. This will be essential if the group is to be successful in carrying out its work in a collaborative and transparent way. It will also be essential for the group to be constituted as soon as possible during Fall 2017 semester.

DEMANDS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Article I. A. Removal of Arne Christenson from the Advisory Board of the Institute of Freedom and Community

Demand:

We demand the removal of Arne Christenson from the Advisory Board of The Institute for Freedom & Community. Given Mr. Christenson’s position as the Managing Director of Policy and Politics for the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, St. Olaf College risks his influence upon the speakers brought to the school, the educational offerings, faculty development workshops, and scholarships sanctioned by the Institute.

1. The justifications for the removal of Arne Christenson are present in the *Remove AIPAC Exec Christenson from Olaf’s Institute for Freedom and Community Advisory Board* by Oles for Justice in Palestine [see below].
2. Additionally, we demand that the administration develops an apparatus for transparency with regards to the funding of the Institute for Freedom and Community, both during the academic year and the summer sessions.

Excerpts from *Remove AIPAC Exec Christenson from Olaf’s Institute for Freedom and Community Advisory Board* by Oles for Justice in Palestine (<https://www.change.org/p/st-olaf-college-board-of-regents-remove-aipac-exec-christenson-from-olaf-s-institute-for-freedom-community-advisory-board>):

We doubt Mr. Christenson's capacity to exert the objectivity needed to accomplish the goals of the Institute's Advisory Board due to his continued leadership in the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC).

AIPAC has a history of actively lobbying for the passage of legislation that aims to limit freedom of inquiry and expression on college campuses. The most recent example of this pattern comes from 2016, when AIPAC supported the Anti-Semitism Awareness Act (H.R. 6421), which was deemed unconstitutional by multiple sources.

AIPAC has also released publications that attempt to vilify pro-Palestinian activists on college campuses. One of these publications, *The AIPAC College Guide: Exposing the anti-Israel campaign on campus* (1984), from which AIPAC has never distanced itself, profiles anti-Israel advocacy from students and faculty on more than one hundred U.S. campuses. In this book, AIPAC delineates its strategies for "defeating the [pro-Palestinian] campaign" on college campuses. "Strengthening and expanding AIPAC's campus presence" is the first of these strategies. "AIPAC, through its presence on campus, arms Israel's friends with the information and training they need to deal effectively with the anti-Israel campaign." The appointment of AIPAC's Managing Director for Policy and Politics to the Advisory Board indisputably constitutes "AIPAC presence on campus."

PLT Response:

This demand is self-explanatory. Mr. Christenson, a graduate of St. Olaf and a well-known and respected figure in Washington, D.C., is Managing Director of AIPAC, the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee. The suggestion to have him engaged with the Institute was based on his knowledge of government and experience in D.C., not on his ties to AIPAC. He does not represent AIPAC on the Institute's Advisory Board.

AIPAC describes itself as "America's Pro-Israel Lobby." AIPAC is a legitimate organization that plays an acknowledged role in our democracy by lobbying on behalf of interests it supports. In the last presidential election, most major candidates from both parties made presentations to AIPAC. This is a good barometer of whether it is a fringe organization or a part of the fabric of American political life. Denying Mr. Christenson engagement with the College because some disagree with his political beliefs violates academic freedom.

Mr. Christenson serves on the Advisory Board of the Institute for Freedom and Community. In that role neither he nor any other member of the Board determines which speakers are brought to campus, or influences educational offerings, faculty development workshops, or scholarships. Members of the Advisory Board advocate for the Institute, review its offerings to ensure that it is fulfilling its mission, and support the Director. Indeed, during Mr.

Christenson's time on the Advisory Board, when the Institute sponsored programming on the Middle East, it was from a pro-Palestinian perspective.

Like other programs at the College, the Institute is supported by gifts. All of the donors that support it are alumni of St. Olaf. The Institute operates with the same level of transparency as similar programs at St. Olaf.

Summarized Discussion:

The origins for this demand lie in the extreme lack of transparency surrounding Mr. Christenson's visit to campus in March 2016, and his subsequent appointment to the Advisory Board of the Institute for Freedom and Community in May 2016. As can be seen in the demand (including the excerpts from the OJP petition) and the PLT response, the specific problem is Mr. Christenson's role on the Advisory Board, given his high-level position in AIPAC, and the lack of transparency surrounding funding of the Institute.

For historical context, the lack of transparency about the formation, the name, the sources of funding, and the governance of the Institute itself had created some significant distrust and opposition to it from the start. The significant and ongoing tensions around the Institute in fact resulted in a year-long discussion during 2015-2016 among faculty about the practices of shared governance of the College by the Board of Regents, the president and the faculty. Mr. Christenson's visit and appointment to the Advisory Board during the spring of that year thus aggravated the already significant distrust about the Institute and its funding.

We had extended and sometimes heated discussions about this demand, given that it centers on the key issues of academic freedom and transparency. Our discussions ended up revolving significantly around the lack of transparency about the funding of the Institute and the relationship and role of the Advisory Board in its operation. This was because the donors were anonymous and an Advisory Board was appointed with initially no information provided to the College community about the need for it, since the Institute already had the Director's Council, nor about the choice of its members, especially Mr. Christenson.

The Advisory Board is now listed on the Institute's webpage, its role being the following: "The Institute Advisory Board, appointed by the Chair of the College's Board of Regents, advises the director of The Institute with a particular eye to ensuring that The Institute fulfills its mission and thus honors the agreements made with the donors who support its work." (<http://institute.stolaf.edu/>). While this provides a kind of transparency, several members of the Task Force raised the question about the need for such a sizable board in order to ensure that it fulfills its mission.

Task Force Recommendations:

After multiple discussions, we decided that this demand stems from an underlying concern for the real or perceived lack of transparency in donations to the Institute. There are multiple voices on the task force -- some see transparency as not a real and underlying problem while others suggested the need for improvement. Some of the concerns arose out of the Institute's formation and its unique structure at the College that created a history of appointments and positions of influence happening without adequate explanation or rationale being provided to the community at large.

Regarding the demand about removal of Arne Christenson, there was no consensus among the Task Force members to recommend that Arne Christenson be taken off the Institute's Advisory Board.

There was concern among our group about the lack of transparency in how Arne Christenson ended up on the Institute's Advisory Board. There was concern among our group about the fact that there is no other entity like the Institute at the College so there is no real comparison available regarding how business is conducted. There were concerns among our group about what the actual roles of the members of the Advisory Board were, in practice, versus what is officially represented as their roles. One person in our group expressed concern that the College can and should be able to accept anonymous gifts, and knowing what a gift is and how it is being utilized by the College is a different issue from identifying who is/are the donor(s). That person also thought that the Institute is working to be transparent in terms of its mission, programming (past and future), and its leadership and advisory board.

There was consensus among the Task Force that continued dialogue is essential between the Institute, the College, the Collective and the St. Olaf community regarding what transparency at the Institute needs to be moving forward, and how the members are selected to serve on the Advisory Board and the input they actually provide the Institute on its mission and programming.

Article I. B. Implementation of Racial Sensitivity Training:

Demand:

We demand the implementation of an equivalent and mandatory racial and cultural sensitivity training session similar to the Think About It and Bystander Training that is enforced on Week One for all incoming first-years.¹⁰ This training would be conducted in

person and online. The completion of the online portion will determine student's accessibility to registration. This needs to be implemented by the Fall of 2019. This should be done in addition to Article III, Section E.

PLT Response:

This demand signals a desire to provide students with training that will prevent incidents of racial bias and harassment. We are already planning to include mandatory online training for students starting with the Fall 2017 semester and to include sessions on diversity and inclusion as part of Week One. We want to continue to explore effective and engaging training methods and welcome recommendations from the Task Force, including how to ensure 100% participation.

Summarized Discussion:

The demands I.B. for racial sensitivity training and I.C. for Sustained Dialogues are related. The Task Force acknowledges the importance of racial sensitivity training at St. Olaf College, but realizing the challenge that implementation presents we planned further discussion. Initially, we discussed available resources online and explored when to schedule the online training. With regard to longer-term instruction, we considered the special needs of athletes and musicians, and questioned whether to offer certificates or GE credits or stipends. We asked how to guarantee regular attendance and quality of experience, and what sort of dynamics fosters trust and builds community. We addressed the limits of the "Think About It" module, asked whether faculty, staff, and administrators should undergo mandatory training, and discussed the strengths of Sustained Dialogue and other models. We also wondered what students should do about insensitive remarks that some faculty might make and what readings on race we recommend.

Task Force Recommendations:

Members of the Task Force agree that all members of the St. Olaf community need racial sensitivity training and that some training be on-going, whether in bite-sized or large chunks. St. Olaf has already responded to the Collective's demand for this campus-wide. The College has implemented an online program that begins this fall. This new program proves substantive and is about an hour long. It is at least as rigorous as the training required for sexual assault. Our Task Force also discussed training for staff and faculty. We understand that the College will be implementing a similar training program as the student training, and we believe this training should also be mandatory. We also discussed the limitations of a single training program and how better results could likely be achieved by adopting a sustained and ongoing training program for all members of the St. Olaf community throughout the academic year.

Article I. C. Mandatory Sustained Dialogue Participation

Demand:

We demand that St. Olaf College enforces a mandatory Sustained Dialogue participation for all student athletes (more specifically varsity athletes), Members of Student Government Executive Team, and Student Senate.

1. This entails participation in a Sustained Dialogue Program for at least the length of a semester (whether made specifically for the team or the College-wide programs which are open to all St Olaf students, faculty, and staff). Varsity student athletes want to be heard and included within the rest of the student body. These dialogues foster an environment that bridges the gap between people who are not teammates or fellow athletes.

2. There must be mandatory Sustained Dialogue facilitator training for all coaches and student leaders of athletic teams including, but not limited to, team captains, vice captains, members of Student Athletic Advisory Board (SAAB), Members of Student Government Executive Team, and Student Senate.

PLT Response:

This demand seeks mandatory diversity training for certain groups of students.

We recommend that the Task Force consider whether there should be focused training, in addition to the training all students will already be receiving, for specific student groups.

Summarized Discussion:

The Task Force considered the Collective's demand for College-wide participation in Sustained Dialogue. This semester-long program requires students, staff, and administrators to be participants or moderators. This non-hierarchical program having multiple moderators demands regular attendance to build community. Varsity athletes, captains, advisory board members, musicians or those who hold positions in student government or serve on the Senate--all have tight schedules. Still, members of the Collective perceive Sustained Dialogue as crucial to climate change at St. Olaf. They want to make it mandatory. Pondering the difficulty of making Sustained Dialogue mandatory, we considered a focus on race, compared race sensitivity training to requirements for sexual violence, and discussed what the law requires. The Task Force agrees that the program is a good one, as group participants determine their focus, dynamics, and level of engagement. The problem remains how best to effectively implement it campus-wide.

Task Force Recommendations:

We support having a program that facilitates dialogue and conversation around difficult topics. We recommend partnering with student groups on campus to identify opportunities for more participation in Sustained Dialogue. The Sustained Dialogue program takes seriously an institutional commitment to structural change. St. Olaf must decide whether it's ready for a change of climate. The College must acknowledge a need for it before attempting to find opportunities for dialogue and fitting it into our community life, academic schedules, GE credits, or reward systems. The Task Force recommends the College facilitate continued dialogue among stakeholders regarding these considerations. While the Task Force formed no clear consensus for requiring all faculty, staff and students

to enroll in Sustained Dialogues, we recommend the College find creative ways to adapt this program to our needs.

Article I. D. Title VI Coordinator

Demand:

We demand that a third-party be hired, trained, and versed in Title VI regulations and be able to facilitate dialogue about campus race relations and tensions. This should be implemented by Fall 2017, alongside the Strategic Plan mentioned in Article II, Section A. Title VI Hire to Facilitate Dialogue.

PLT Response:

We are not certain what is meant here by a “third party” nor exactly what this person or entity would do other than facilitate dialogue. We recommend that the Task Force seek to understand exactly what the role of this third party would be and then consider this idea in light of resources already available at the College.

Summarized Discussion:

Our discussion of this demand revolved around the core of the demand itself: the need for a new position on campus to be filled by someone with expertise in Title VI regulations. Expertise and experience with Title VI is essential for this position. And given the duties it would require, we agreed it cannot reasonably be filled by any current employee of the College. Furthermore, we all agreed that it is essential for the College to dedicate resources to this position both because of the importance of the role this person would play on campus, and because it would demonstrate a strong and clear commitment to addressing campus race relations and tensions, and to facilitating dialogue about them, in relation to Title VI legislation and national best practices.

Task Force Recommendations:

We recommend that the College hire an individual knowledgeable in the regulations and law relating to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended. The hiring process should begin immediately, with the goal of having someone in place no later than the end of the 2017-2018 academic year. The position can initially be part time, depending on workload. The College should consult with the Collective for their input and vision for this position before proceeding with the formal hiring process. The person hired will monitor and evaluate the implementation of all the new policies and programs to be created, facilitated and implemented by the College to address institutional racism on campus. The person in the position should provide the semester updates referenced in the recommendation regarding Demand V. C., facilitate opportunities for continued dialogue about campus race relations and tensions, and provide regular written reports to the

President and St. Olaf community consistent with the spirit of these recommendations and as permitted by law. Starting in the fall of 2018, and continuing annually thereafter, the person in this position should give a presentation to all incoming first year students during Week 1, as the College has been doing recently on Title IX and sexual assault.

There was consensus that ongoing transparency demands this independent position be created, separate and apart from existing positions at the College. The person in this position should report directly to the President.

Article I. E. Administration Acknowledgement of Occupied Dakota Land

Demand:

We demand that the administration acknowledge in a public manner that this institution is built on occupied Dakota land and the original occupants were victims of genocide and forced removal.

PLT Response:

This demand is self-explanatory. This is a matter that affects the entire region in which St. Olaf is located, not just the campus, and it refers to actions that pre-date the founding of the College. We recommend that the Task Force consider how best to respond to this demand.

Summarized Discussion:

The land upon which the St. Olaf College campus is located is among the 24 million acres of the Territory of Minnesota that were ceded to the United States in the 1851 Treaty of Traverse de Sioux with the Wahpeton and Sisseton bands of Upper Dakota. When the United States failed to honor this and other treaties, the Dakota War of 1862 ensued. Years later, the Hill was acquired by the College's founders in a private sale from a Northfield farmer. We believe the College can and should recognize the dark history of the United States' treatment of Native Peoples including on the very land where our College is located.

Task Force Recommendations:

The Task Force agrees that the College should publicly acknowledge that the College is built on occupied Dakota land, and that the original occupants were victims of genocide and forced removal. We recommend further study of the provenance of this land to best acknowledge the history, and that this information be posted and publicly announced on the College's website by January 1, 2018. The College should also recognize the importance and history of the Hill in relation to Dakota land in a recurring way, rather than in only a single event. In addition, we recommend the College invite individuals from the Dakota people to campus, to talk about the history of the area, as an educational event and an important act of ethical behavior and goodwill.

Article II. A. Strategic 10-Year Diversity Plan for Faculty and Staff

Demand:

We demand that the College composes and commits to a strategic 10-year plan by the end of the Fall of 2017. This plan's focus will be to increase recruitment and retention of Indigenous, Black/African-American, Latinx-American, Asian-American, Multiracial, and Non-American faculty and staff members across all academic disciplines and administrative departments.

1. Publish a report at the end of each academic year highlighting how the administration has been meeting Goal III of The Strategic Plan.

PLT Response:

We recognize the importance of staff, faculty, and student diversity. That is why it's a key goal stated in our Strategic Plan established in 2011 and updated in 2015. That goal is: to "Increase the racial, ethnic, and geographic diversity of St. Olaf students, faculty, and staff

A. Increase by at least 1% the percentage of domestic minority students enrolling each year.

B. Increase sustained engagement among students who are demographically different from one another, so that by spring 2018, St. Olaf's "Discussions with Diverse Others" engagement indicator in the National Survey of Student Engagement exceeds the mean indicator for other baccalaureate colleges.

C. Continue to increase faculty diversity through recruitment, such that at least 30% of new tenure-track faculty hires (on a rolling three-year average) will be diverse.

D. Continue to increase staff diversity through recruitment, such that by 2020 the diversity demographics of our staff reflect the diversity demographics of the College's hiring markets."

We believe the best response to this demand is to continue our successful pursuit of the goals already in place. We commit to reporting annually on progress towards this goal. See Addendum A for data that currently tracks progress towards these goals.

Summarized Discussion:

The Task Force agreed with the PLT that St. Olaf College promotes diversity among administrators, faculty, and staff. In 2015 the College updated its strategic plan, and in response to the Collective's demands the PLT aims to regularly update this report. However, there is much work to be done about the recruitment and retention of administrators, staff, and faculty of color.

There are too few faculty, staff, and administrators of color, and some leave because of the racial climate on campus. The Task Force discussed the difficulties inherent in job descriptions that spell out racial preferences, but real problems arise when departments

fail to include or actually eliminate qualified people of color from search pools. Evidently, power and politics still stand in the way of competitive and equal employment at St. Olaf College.

The College simply has no working institutional structures to adequately address the retention of administrators, staff, and faculty of color. St. Olaf needs to create a more welcoming climate and more supports for this body of employees. It must provide incentives for people to work with employees of color.

Task Force Recommendations:

The Task Force recommends the College implement this demand by Spring 2018, and that the Title VI Coordinator called for in I. D. above, be directly involved in implementing this plan in conjunction with the Assistant to the President for Institutional Diversity. In addition to hiring the new Coordinator, St Olaf could institute mentoring that extends to underrepresented employees, equate race and ethnic studies with traditional programs, count the community service of employees of color to marginalized students, fairly review their work performances, allocate more funds for their IGS programs, and allow some release time for growing the smallest of these programs.

Article II. B. Academic Freedom

Demand:

We demand the College not threaten the jobs of faculty, staff, or administrators that support our list of demands.

1. To enforce this, the Academic Freedom enshrined on faculty shall also include the ability to critique St. Olaf College as an institution without fear of institutional overreach.
2. The College will intervene when members of faculty make statements that either undermine the identities and lived experiences of marginalized members of the community or promote prejudice.

PLT Response:

We understand this demand to mean that the college should protect the ability of faculty and staff to express their views about the College without fear of retaliation.

We concur and have always acted accordingly. Section 4.II. of the St. Olaf Faculty Manual details the nature and scope of academic freedom at the college. In accordance with its provisions, the College does not engage in threats to faculty or staff when they disagree with institutional policies or actions. Faculty and staff are free to disagree with the College, just as the College is free to respond to such criticism and to address misconduct should it occur. The college is committed to appropriately investigating all claims of harassment, threats and other violations of our policies.

Summarized Discussion:

The Task Force noted a gap between theory and practice and wondered what in particular caused the Collective to make this demand and how they envision St. Olaf enforcing it. We acknowledged that there is a real problem with governance at St. Olaf. We also shared illustrative stories.

Task Force Recommendations:

There is a tension between the healthy formal College policy of academic freedom (and how to enforce it) with the unhealthy practical reality of Institutional racism and historical barriers that undermine the intention underlying academic freedom. The Faculty Manual is instructive regarding academic freedom, stating, in part, at Section 4, II. 4:

College teachers are citizens of a learned profession, and members of a particular educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from Institutional censors or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As a member of a learned profession and a particular college, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should show respect for the opinions of others, and make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the college.

We recommend the College take proactive steps to change the underlying culture that informs how this policy actually plays out in real life. In addition to aggressively protecting the rights of faculty and staff to express their views about the College without fear of retribution, it also means encouraging and fostering more truth telling, less isolation of people who may disagree, and working to sustain a narrative rooted in the St. Olaf tradition of investing in lives and relationships. Truth telling and transparency must be encouraged by administration at all levels so faculty and staff do not fear their truth telling and requests for more transparency will be used against them in subtle, indirect and unhealthy ways that serve to undermine both the policy and spirit of academic freedom that the College is firmly committed to upholding.

We recommend faculty, staff and administration receive appropriate training to empower faculty and staff to speak out against Institutional racism and the resulting unhealthy behaviors that manifest themselves due to a real or perceived fear of its potential negative impact on their careers. We encourage the administration to lean into the messiness and discomfort brought about by such increased transparency and truth telling and embrace the opportunities it creates for a positive change in the College's culture, consistent with the College's values.

Article III. A. Comprehensive Racial Awareness Curriculum

Demand:

We demand that Race and Ethnic Studies Department create a comprehensive curriculum that addresses the sociopolitical dimensions of race, ethnicity, and identity. This curriculum will prescribe mandatory interdisciplinary courses for all students.

PLT Response:

This demand appears to seek mandatory diversity training for students, faculty and Staff. This Demand appears to overlap with Demands 1.B and 1.C. We recommend that the Task Force consider this demand along with those and recommend what kind of overall ongoing training might be required and what kind of oversight it might have.

Summarized Discussion:

See III. B. below.

Task Force Recommendations:

See III. B. below.

Article III. B. Reconstruction of Current GE Requirements

Demand:

We demand the reconstruction of the current General Education requirements in place. Rather than condensing issues regarding class, race, gender and sexuality into the Multicultural Studies: Domestic/Global requirements, we demand that the college create a minimum of two GE's that enforce mandatory introductory courses in Race & Ethnic Studies and Women's & Gender Studies departments. These courses should complement GE's like the Biblical Studies (BTS-T/B), History of Western Culture (HWC), and Ethics (EIN) courses which focus mostly on European philosophical, theological, political and sociological perspectives.

1. HWC courses must address histories of colonization, identity, institutional and systemic oppression. Many of the "International students" come from previously colonized nations. HWC must include the influence of Western colonization on the peoples who have been colonized by European nations.
2. These courses need to meet requirements outlined in Article III, Section D.

PLT Response:

This demand seeks changes to the College's General Education requirements. As this demand recognizes, a faculty-student Task Force is currently reviewing the College's General Education requirements. They should be allowed to complete their work. We understand that they have already acted to change the composition of the Task Force.

Summarized Discussion:

Demand III. A. calls for a new comprehensive curriculum, and Demand III. B. makes specific demands about how to reconstruct the current GE requirements. It therefore seems most useful to consider these two demands together in our recommendation. Because III. B. presents specific demands and reasons for them, and because the GE curriculum is the only one that specifies requirements for all students, it would also seem most useful to focus on III. B. for framing our recommendation.

Demands III.A. and B. ask for two things: 1) new courses to be developed as GE requirements and/or current courses—specifically introductory courses in Race and Ethnic Studies (RACE) and Women’s and Gender Studies (WMGST) to be made GE requirements, and 2) some current GE courses to be modified in terms of content, so that discussions of class, race, gender and sexuality are not limited to only MCD/G courses, but incorporated into the BTS-T/B, HWC and EIN GE courses to complement and balance their focus on European perspectives and their lack of attention to Western colonialism.

In terms of current courses offered, and Introduction to RACE courses in particular, the demand for these courses has been growing significantly in recent years, but there has not been a significant increase in the number of such courses offered, nor any increase of resources with which to offer more of them. While it’s difficult to know the exact effects that adding new GE attributes to existing courses might have on the need for additional sections and faculty to teach them, it is clear that additional faculty with expertise in these areas would be needed to teach additional sections of introductory courses in RACE and WMGST.

One possible model for expanding the number of sections offered of Introduction to RACE could be through the First Year Writing (FYW) program. This could involve adapting the current FYW courses to include race, ethnicity, class, sexuality, colonialism, inequality, etc.

Task Force Recommendations:

We recommend that the College provide resources to create a comprehensive curriculum that addresses the sociopolitical dimensions of race, ethnicity, and identity. We recognize the importance of Race and Ethnic Studies as an integral part of the College’s curriculum, but the limited resources dedicated to it prevents it from having the kind of impact such an integral part of the curriculum should have. We thus recommend that the College increase funding for the Race and Ethnic Studies (RACE) in order to offer more sections of their two core courses, and/or additional core courses. Additional teaching-FTE would be essential for this; additional funding for programming and/or administrative assistance would also be recommended. These changes would help both to meet the increased demand for these

courses, and contribute toward balancing the overall Eurocentric emphasis of the curriculum as a whole.

In terms of modifying current courses and attributes in the GE curriculum to balance its Eurocentric emphasis, we recommend that the GE Task Force consider the specific points made in the demand itself. These would include expanding discussions of class, race, gender and sexuality beyond the MCD/MCG courses, and incorporating them into the BTS-T/B, HWC and EIN GE courses to complement and balance their focus on European perspectives and their lack of attention to Western colonialism. We also recommend that a working group perform a deeper review by meeting with members of the Collective to better understand the details of their demand and meet with the GE Task Force to better understand the progress toward these goals as well as to provide input prior to the new GE requirements becoming final.

To ensure adequate preparation for teaching courses with MCD/D attributes, we recommend that faculty be required to participate in training sessions prior to teaching these courses. A possible model for this could be the training that happens for faculty to teach courses that carry the EIN attribute. The recently awarded To Include is To Excel Mellon Grant began on July 1, 2017 and continues until 2021. Funds from the grant could be a potential initial source of funding for this kind of training, and will enable us to undertake faculty development and curricular improvements that align inclusion and excellence.

The Title VI Working Group should partner with the To Include is To Excel Director and Interim Director to understand the process and support their efforts where needed. Additionally, the Title VI Working Group should address how to augment the student curriculum with opportunities for staff and faculty to take seminars and/or classes centered on race as well as mandatory training.

Article III. C. Required Events for Students in MCD/G Courses

Demand:

We demand that MCD/G courses require students to attend events that are held by organizations that fall under the Diversity Celebrations Committee (DCC). These events will hold the same weight as Wellness Center Swiped Events for Studies in Physical Movement (SPM) courses and the Pink Card System.

PLT Response:

This demand is also self-explanatory. We recommend that the Task Force consider this recommendation.

Summarized Discussion:

We discussed how Wellness Center Swiped Events and the Pink Card System for Fine Arts events worked. Given the wide range of events sponsored by the DCC, we decided it would be a good idea for some office or offices on campus (e.g. CMIE and/or IOS) to be designated to approve events that are substantive and appropriate enough in their content to meet the MCD/G requirement; as with Wellness Swipe events, this approval would be on the calendar with the event description.

We also discussed how best to monitor attendance at these events, and the model used by the Physics department for their required events was suggested, in which each student must write their name, email and a couple of questions for the speaker on a card that they turn in at the end of each event. We agreed this would be an ideal model for this demand.

Task Force Recommendations:

Recognizing the need for ongoing opportunities for students to learn and support inclusion, we recommend implementation of this demand. It would be a great way to ensure ongoing touchpoints for students beyond mandatory diversity training. The Title VI Working Group should discuss this recommendation with faculty and the Diversity Celebrations Committee, CMIE and/or other relevant offices to understand how to best implement this initiative.

Article III. D. Cross-disciplinary Relationships throughout Campus Spaces

Demand:

We demand that courses on race, gender and sexuality, and intersectionality get taught in different spaces throughout the campus and not be limited by their departmental buildings. This would encourage cross-disciplinary relationships between students and faculty members in various departments.

PLT Response:

We think this demand seeks for courses to not necessarily be taught all in the same building where the department offering them is housed.

We don't know enough about the constraints that the Registrar operates with in scheduling classes and rooms to respond immediately to this demand, but we will ask the Registrar to take this under advisement.

Summarized Discussion:

Currently courses on race and ethnic studies and other interdisciplinary courses are taught in spaces throughout the campus. We agree with the Collective's apparent premise that wide exposure of these classes around campus will promote interest by and integration within the community.

Task Force Recommendations:

We recommend that the Title VI Working Group meet with members of the Collective, the Registrar, members of the Deans Council, and other campus stakeholders to review this issue and make recommendations to the College for specific actions to be taken to advance these goals.

Article IV. A. Zero Tolerance Policy on Hate Crimes, Hate Speech and Bias

Demand:

We demand that St. Olaf establish a strict zero tolerance policy on racial, sexual, and homophobic epithets for faculty, staff, and students. These hate crimes must be held with the same sincerity that the College holds to its no tolerance policy for drinking and smoking. This means that when such incidents occur, the College will impose real consequences on the perpetrators, including citations or potential expulsions as stated in Article VII: Conduct Policies of the Code of Student Conduct.

1. The College will establish a Response Team similar to the Univ. of Mississippi Bias Incident Response Team to effectively assess and respond to incidents of bias, hate speech, and discrimination.

Summarized Discussion:

We understand that language of this demand to be a reflection of the frustration with the current lack of clear reporting mechanism and adjudication system. We discussed the implications of a zero tolerance policy and agreed that although incidents of bias, racism and violence must be addressed as serious policy violations, a policy that has inflexible prescribed sanctions could create unintended barriers to reporting. The manner in which the College addresses violations should not deter victims from reporting.

Task Force Recommendations:

We recommend that the College, in policy and practice, treat violations seriously and when sanctioning such conduct it should consider various factors including: the severity of the conduct; any previous infractions by the perpetrator; the wishes of the victim; and the impact of the conduct upon the community. The College recently adapted a protocol for responding to bias incidents and has adapted an online incident form designed to improve

and increase reporting. We encourage the Title VI Working Group to review the College's current practices, explore best practices at other higher education institutions, and discuss options for further improvement with members of the Collective and other stakeholders in our community. The Bias Response Team that the College is currently designing will be an important element in addressing this demand.

Article IV. B. Definition of a Hate Crime

Demand:

We demand that the definition of a "hate crime" be reconstructed. This is an example of a citation that should be considered:

1. The federal definition of a hate crime is "a crime in which the defendant intentionally selects a victim, because of the actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, disability, or sexual orientation of any person." Also, known as bias-based crimes, hate crimes are considered "message crimes," or offenses that send a message of fear and terror to community members with similar traits.

PLT Response:

This demand reflects a desire for clarity and specificity in the definition of a "hate crime."

We prefer to continue using the College's definition of "hate crime" because it relies upon the definition contained in federal regulations under the Clery Act and because it is in wide use in higher education institutions.

In accordance with two federal laws, the Clery Act and the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, the College collects and reports upon incidents of hate crimes occurring on the St. Olaf campus. Similar to the definition proposed by the Collective, College policy defines a "Hate Crime" as "a criminal offense against a person or property which is motivated, in whole or in part, by the offender's bias. Bias is a preformed negative opinion or attitude toward a group of persons based on their race, gender, gender identity, religion, sexual orientation, ethnicity, national origin or disability." <http://wp.stolaf.edu/publicsafety/crime-definitions/>

Summarized Discussion:

In our discussion of this demand, we weighed the College's general commitment to free speech against the College's interest in keeping students safe. While we recognize that we need free speech in order to ensure a space for intellectual exploration, we also understand that the safety of students is a necessary condition for learning.

Task Force Recommendations:

We recommend the College keep its current definition of “hate crime” from the Clery Act for federal reporting purposes. However, given our College’s mission of being welcoming to all, we also recommend the College establish an additional guideline that defines and sanctions language and acts that involve bias based on race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, etc. Given the lack of legal consensus on the dividing line between hate speech and hate crimes, and the apparent limitations of each of these legal terms in covering all acts, symbols and language that can involve bias, we agreed that what is needed is a clear term and/or definition for behavior, language, and/or symbols of bias and hate that are not covered by the Clery Act and the federal definition of a hate crime.

We encourage the Title VI Working Group to engage in further study and discernment to identify a standard the College should use to identify forms of hate speech, behavior and symbols of bias that will not be tolerated at St. Olaf. These could include nooses, Confederate flags, and other symbols of hatred, racism and white supremacy.

Article V. A Report Form

Demand:

We demand a more accessible and properly marketed Discrimination and Bias Report Form.

1. This form must be open to faculty, staff, students, and community members to use in order to report incidents of discrimination and/or bias.
2. Student complaints must be forwarded to both the Director of Human Resources and Dean of Students.

PLT Response:

This demand seeks improvements to the Discrimination and Bias Report form.

We agree that the current college web page on [Incidents of Bias, Harassment, and Hate Crimes](#), including information on how to report such incidents, needs expansion and improvement. This will be accomplished over the summer of 2017, drawing on the work the college has done to make Title IX–related reporting timely and simple. The current online [Community Concern Form](#) can be completed by anyone in the community, but it focuses on incidents of discrimination or bias committed by students. The College will develop an expanded reporting form that can be used to report behaviors by faculty and staff as well as students; this form will be completed and linked in several places on the College website prior to the arrival of new students in Fall 2017. The current [Community Concern Form](#) is already received by the Dean of Students and the Associate Dean of Students for Residence Life. The revised or new form that will be in place by next fall will

be received by the Director of Human Resources as well, in case the behavior being reported pertains to a faculty or staff member.

Summarized Discussion:

Members of the Task Force shared their experiences with racist incidents within departments and as students on campus and explained how the College addressed these incidents. We discussed legal issues, possible prosecutions of code violations, some reporting mechanisms but also their advantages and disadvantages. In addition, we examined in the Clery Act definitions of hate speech and hate crimes, noting gaps in the reporting system. A member of the Task Force said that St Olaf College has signed a contract for new case management software. It will be implemented this fall. This will mean a single system for handling all cases on campus, including sexual assault, Title IX, racism, and other forms of discrimination.

The President's Leadership Team announced the development of an expanded report form available next fall. We requested the Deans of Students and Human Resources provide more information. According to their update, a form was added to the College's webpage on Diversity and Inclusion. Individuals can use it to report incidents of racism. (Link: <https://cm.maxient.com/reportingform.php?StOlafCollege>). Finally, members of the Task Force examined the report form that Carleton College's Bias Concern Response Team uses.

Task Force Recommendations:

The Task Force believes that the College needs to improve its current reporting mechanism. The report form should be accessible to all students. Students should be informed about the presence of the form and their rights when reporting racial bias and discrimination. An educational section should be added to the induction week, for the first year students and also other members of the St. Olaf community. An expert in the field needs to read these reports and oversee the reporting process.

In regards to the President's Leadership Team Response, members of the Task Force were informed about both the new bias-incident report form on the Diversity and Inclusion webpage and the College's new case management software contract for handling all cases on campus. The College will publicize this and all other reporting options to the campus community. The College will consult with experts and with all stakeholders in the community about possible additional improvements in the form, initially and after evaluation of the form by the end of 2017-2018.

Article V. B. Transparency

Demand:

In addition to effectively using all of the school's resources when furthering the safety of these students, faculty, and staff, we demand that there be transparency between the victims of hate crimes and the administration.

PLT Response:

This demand seeks transparency between victims of hate crimes and the College. The college practices transparency, recognizing the limits based on privacy law and other legal obligations. We encourage the Task Force to consider best practices for reporting and communications with victims based on the work of the Title IX Working Group.

Summarized Discussion:

The Task Force discussed the work of the Title IX Working Group, and the reporting practices of victims of hate speech and hate crimes but also addressed issues of privacy, transparency and support for victims. We revisited definitions of hate speech and hate crimes, noting that presently the College need not report incidents that technically are not hate crimes, even if some behaviors terrorize people historically marginalized.

Task Force Recommendations:

St. Olaf College needs resources to insure privacy and to provide adequate supports for victims of bias and hate. The Task Force on Institutional Racism wondered whether SARN provides a good model for drawing volunteers, providing training, and a place for victims of bias to find peer support. If victims and victimizers had truly private outlets for healing or reconciliation then the College might be able to reduce incidences of discrimination on campus.

On the contrary, when the College goes public with reports on one student, it hinders investigations. In fact, it diminishes the seriousness of racism on campus, especially when other incidents are not investigated or reported. That this was the unfortunate experience and conclusion reached by those operating within an imperfect system is an outcome not consistent with the values of the College. There is a real feeling among some who come forward with their complaint that they have ended up as the one punished, and not the true perpetrator. There are those on the Hill whose experiences and frustrations with the College's responses to bias has led them to seriously question the College's underlying commitment to owning the extent of the problem of bias that exists in our community. The core values and welcoming community purported by the College must transfer into a culture of transparency, where bias is called out and dealt with openly and honestly, consistent with our values. Rather than mete out severe punishments, too, we might consider ways to promote discussion and reconciliation, at least in some cases. The Task Force wants the College to be more transparent once administrators determine cases of bias.

The College can learn from its handling of past cases involving code violations. Knowing who came up for code violations and what processes that sanctioned students underwent

will go a long way toward promoting trust and transparency. With real data, St. Olaf can assess best practices for addressing future bias reports. The College must guard against punishing victims who come forward with their complaints, or at least ask, whether or how well we do in our evaluations of institutional strategies. St. Olaf must also consider what mechanisms are or are not in place and educate reporting parties of their options for pursuing disciplinary action. This process should include updates on a weekly basis.

Article V. C. Semester Updates

Demand:

We demand semester updates from the President's Office and other campus entities highlighting specific actions that have been taken in the upcoming terms to address our demands and improve campus climate.

PLT Response:

This demand seeks public reporting on initiatives to improve campus climate. We are happy to provide periodic updates. We are considering the best place from which to issue reports so that, for consistency, the reports can come from one place rather than from several different campus entities, including the President's Office.

Summarized Discussion:

The Task Force discussed that the last part of this demand refers back to the demands as a whole, tying it back to Demand I.D., as well as to all the policies and processes recommended by the demands and/or which are being implemented already by the College. The Task Force thought this should be an ongoing process for the College and thought that it, therefore, made sense to do annual updates rather than semester updates.

Task Force Recommendations:

This demand is tied to the role of the new Title VI Coordinator proposed in Demand I.D. and recommended by this Task Force on Institutional Racism. There was consensus that it would be beneficial to have a good, organized access point to updates on what the College has done so far, as well as what is being proposed. The Title VI Coordinator will serve as that access point on campus. We recommend that the new Title VI Coordinator's responsibilities should include providing these annual updates to students, faculty, staff and alumni, in varied formats that invite questions and feedback. One of the formats could include an annual open forum on campus to report to the St. Olaf community, answer questions, and solicit input as to what the community thinks is working or not working, and what work still needs to be done.

Article VI. A. Counseling Center

Demand:

We demand that St. Olaf College hire a person of color as counselor for the Boe House Counseling Center to account for the wellbeing and mental health of marginalized students. This counselor will be hired in addition to the current staff. We demand a plan for the hiring process be established by Fall 2017, as part of Article II, Section A. [Article II. A. demands that the College compose and commit to a strategic 10-year plan to increase recruitment and retention of Indigenous, Black/African-American, Latinx-American, Asian-American, Multiracial, and Non-American faculty and staff members across all academic disciplines and administrative departments.]

PLT Response:

This demand seeks both added staff in the counseling and health center and diversity among the staff. We do not anticipate increasing staffing in the Counseling Center or the Health Center, or indeed anywhere at the College, but we are committed to increasing diversity in the staffing of the Counseling Center as opportunity permits. In compliance with state and federal anti-discrimination laws, we do not exclude applicants of any race, national origin, or other protected class status.

Summarized Discussion:

This demand addresses a lack of counselors of color at Boe House. At the same time, it links this demand to that of a strategic 10-year plan to increase staff and faculty of color at St. Olaf (II. A.). Currently, there are no counselors with experience and expertise in working with marginalized students, and neither specialists in discrimination, hate speech, nor other forms of prejudice.

Given the national attention devoted now to mental health in higher education, and the negative effects that discrimination, prejudice and microaggressions have on mental health, the basis for this demand is clear. Members of the Task Force provided both anecdotal data about the experiences of students of color and the brief bibliographical summary of relevant academic research on counseling and students of color that follows our recommendations below.

Hiring counselors with expertise in discrimination would thus improve the quality of life for students of color, and contribute to improving the campus climate as a whole. It would also lighten the burden on faculty and staff of color who have long provided support to students of color and other marginalized students, in addition to shouldering their teaching and administrative duties.

Task Force Recommendations:

Based on near-unanimous agreement among Task Force members, we recommend that the College hire at least one new counselor with experience and expertise in working with students of color and marginalized students, and expertise in the effects of racial, ethnic and other forms of discrimination on students' mental health. Aware of the need for additional budget allocation for such a position, we suggest that the new position(s) be drafted by spring of 2018 in order to recruit during 2018-2019, so that the new counselor(s) would begin employment in the fall of 2019. We also recommend that the Title VI Working Group meet with counselors at the Boe House to solicit their input and expertise on this issue.

Psychological Counseling and Students of Color: A Brief Bibliographic Summary

1. It is widely recognized that racial and ethnic differences adversely affect the provision of mental health care to a significant degree—even greater than that shaping access to healthcare in general.

E.g., in two turn-of-the-millennium reports from the federal Department of Health and Human Services that researchers continue to cite, sharp racial disparities in mental health care are clearly highlighted:

“Even more than other areas of health and medicine, the mental health field is plagued by disparities in the availability of and access to its services. These disparities are viewed readily through the lenses of racial and cultural diversity, age, and gender” (U.S. Dept. of Health 1999: vi).

In addition to challenges faced by all Americans (e.g., cost, lack of availability, etc.), particular obstacles confront peoples of color, including “distrust and fear of maltreatment, racism and discrimination, and differences in language and communication. . . . More broadly, mental health care disparities may also stem from minorities' historical and present day struggles with racism and discrimination, which affect their mental health and contribute to their lower economic, social, and political status” (U.S. Dept. of Health 2001: 4).

2. Recent research suggests that effective counseling of students of color on college campuses requires the recognition of several key factors and conditions.

Some research has suggested that students of color do *not* use counseling services at rates similar to their rates of enrollment (e.g., Davidson *et al* 2004), while another study (more recent, with a larger sample size) suggests they do (Hayes *et al* 2011). However, even this latter work acknowledges that . . .

3. Students of color need *more psychological services* than white students.

“At the same time, it must be kept in mind that students of color generally experience greater distress related to depression, hostility, family concerns, social anxiety, and academic issues than European American students do” (Hayes *et al* 2011: 112).

“It could be argued that, whereas students of color are utilizing counseling services at rates consistent with overall campus enrollments, they are underutilizing services relative to their psychological needs” (Hayes *et al* 2011: 112).

Other evidence supporting this contention:

“Alaska Native/American Indian, Asian American, and multiracial/multiethnic students all had significantly more distressed thinking or suicidal thoughts than other students in the sample” (Brownson *et al* 2014: 126).

“Asian American students had some of the highest rates of distressing thoughts (e.g., ‘I wish I were dead’) compared with other students” (Brownson *et al* 2014: 126).

“Caucasian/White students were advised to seek help from the first person they told at statistically significantly higher rates than all other racial and ethnic groups” (Brownson *et al* 2014: 126).

4. Also, in terms of ensuring that students of color use counseling services at high rates, the ethno-racial diversity of counseling staff is crucial.

“Utilization of counseling center services for students of color is predicted by the ethnic composition of counseling center staff,” i.e., “the higher the percentage of African American therapists at a university counseling center, the greater the percentage of African American students who sought services,” etc. (Hayes *et al* 2011: 113).

5. Accordingly, studies often recommend robust *supplementary* efforts on the part of schools to meet these students’ of color needs.

“These results suggest that colleges and universities need to increase their efforts in mental health promotion with these students and perhaps consider whether the typical means of reaching them are culturally relevant for these particular groups” (Brownson *et al* 2014: 126).

References

Chris Brownson, Martin Swanbrow Becker, Richard Shadick, Shanna S. Jaggars, and Yael Nitkin-Kaner. 2014. “Suicidal Behavior and Help Seeking Among Diverse College Students.” *Journal of College Counseling* 17: 116-130.

Davidson, M. M., Yakushka, O. F., & Sanford-Martens, T. C. 2004. Racial and Ethnic Minority Clients' Utilization of a University Counseling Center: An Archival Study. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 32, 259-271.

Jeffrey A. Hayes, Soo Jeong Youn, Louis G. Castonguay, Benjamin D. Locke, Andrew A. McAleavey, and Sam Nordberg. 2011. "Rates and Predictors of Counseling Center Use Among College Students of Color." *Journal of College Counseling*.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 2001. *Mental Health: Culture, Race, and Ethnicity—A Supplement to Mental Health: A Report of the Surgeon General*. Rockville, MD: Author.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 1999. *Mental Health: A Report of the Surgeon General*. Rockville, MD: Author.

Article VI. B. Scholarships for Students of Color and CPT Applications for International Students

Demand:

We demand that the college meet the financial needs of students of color through merit and need-based scholarships, giving special consideration for first generation students of color.

1. The college must make an effort to get alumni and donors to directly fund programs and resources that are established for the well being and success of students of color, for example, Center for Multicultural and International Engagement (CMIE) and TRIO/SSS. St. Olaf College must promote and advocate for the funding of these programs with the same attention and enthusiasm given in promoting the campaign, *Bring Ice Home*.

2. The college should fund curricular practical training (CPT) applications for international students with academic internships, especially for students on need-based financial aid or scholarship programs.

PLT Response:

This demand seeks financial aid for students of color, especially first generation students. The College already meets the demonstrated financial need of every student it enrolls. Our financial aid expenditure approximates \$60 million annually. Depending upon the amount of need an individual student has, that aid may include work-study and loans as well as grants.

Summarized Discussion:

See VI. B. 1 and 2 below.

Task Force Recommendations:

See VI. B.1 and VI. B.2 below.

Article VI. B. 1. Scholarships for Students of Color

Demand:

1. The college must make an effort to get alumni and donors to directly fund programs and resources that are established for the well being and success of students of color, for example, Center for Multicultural and International Engagement (CMIE) and TRIO/SSS. St. Olaf College must promote and advocate for the funding of these programs with the same attention and enthusiasm given in promoting the campaign, *Bring Ice Home*.

PLT Response:

This demand seeks more attention to fundraising for programs that serve students of color. St. Olaf College already promotes and advocates for the funding of such programs. As part of the current campaign “For the Hill and Beyond” the College has focused on fundraising for access to the College and to the St. Olaf experience via financial aid, including specific Posse scholarships, opportunity funds, student life funds, and funds that allow access to high-impact practices including international and off-campus study and internships.

To date, the campaign has raised \$41.3 million for financial aid (with \$16.4 million matched by unrestricted funds from the College’s endowment for a total of \$57.7 million), \$3.2 million for opportunity funds (with \$2.2 million matched from the endowment for a total of \$5.4 million), \$6.3 million for scholarships for international and off-campus study (with \$3.3 million matched by the endowment for a total of \$8.7 million), and \$5.8 million to fund internships (with \$3.6 million matched by the endowment for a total of \$9.4 million).

The ice arena capital project “Bring Ice Home” is one small part of this overall campaign effort. The goal of \$6 million for the ice arena reflects 3% of the total \$200 million targeted in the campaign. The majority of focus of the campaign is raising \$159 million in endowment (80% of the \$200 million goal) so that we can support the people and programs of the college on an ongoing basis. The remaining 17% (\$35 million of the \$200 million goal) is targeted at raising funds through the Annual Fund.

Through the Annual Fund, donors can direct their dollars to any program they choose, including services that meet the needs of students.

The College regularly seeks grants that support student access to high-impact practices. St. Olaf has successfully sought grants supporting underrepresented and low-income students in the sciences and mathematics. The College also has been awarded a grant of \$800,000 from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. The “To Include is to Excel” grant will focus on improving learning outcomes for all students.

Summarized Discussion:

St. Olaf grants need-based scholarships to newly admitted students, and the Financial Aid Office helps students to finance the cost of their education after they have been here. The College continues to grow its capacity to serve students through fundraising opportunities. The Task Force discussed other St. Olaf financial aid campus programs which are mostly funded with federal grants. Members of the Task Force noted that not all students are eligible for some of the available funding. First generation, DACA, and international students are not always eligible, and there are times between semesters or between years when some students of color have to search for funding before they can enroll in class, suggesting a need sometimes to close a gap in either the timing or the amount of their funding.

Task Force Recommendations:

As stated in the PLT's response to the Collective's demands, St. Olaf College meets the demonstrated financial need of every student it enrolls. Alumni play an important role as donors, and the number of international alumni and former students of color are increasing. Regarding internship opportunities for international students, the Title VI Working Group should seek advice from experts in immigration law to identify aid opportunities that comply with legal obligations and avoid jeopardizing these students' immigration status. We also recommend that the Title VI Working Group seek input and expertise from all relevant stakeholders in the St. Olaf community and beyond to learn more about these and any other gaps in providing for students' financial needs, and seek expertise on how best to address these gaps.

Article VI. B. 2. CPT Applications for International Students

Demand:

2. The college should fund curricular practical training (CPT) applications for international students with academic internships, especially for students on need-based financial aid or scholarship programs.

PLT Response:

This demand is self-explanatory. We understand that U.S. immigration law imposes a financial cost on international students undertaking an academic internship that is not imposed on domestic students. We will explore ways to address this challenge.

Summarized Discussion:

Because international students are ineligible for federal funding, they cannot benefit from Trio and SSS programs, which provide cultural and academic support important to student retention. The Upward Bound, McNair, and Posse programs offer additional services not available to international students, so we wondered what resources St. Olaf College draws

on to better assist them. At Present the Piper Center is best able to provide international students with much needed assistance. Before Bill Green left St. Olaf College, he also established an Alumni Network for the students he served, largely international alumni and former students of color committed to the College, individuals who want to serve. Furthermore, we think it is a good idea to provide a counseling service that caters to international students.

Task Force Recommendations:

The Piper Center can schedule alumni visits to campus, during which returnees advise students about opportunities for internships, off-campus study, and employment. Students do not want to begin applications for which they prove ineligible. The Piper Center should generate lists of information specifically useful to international students, including everything from experiential learning, classes that provide international opportunities, and ideas for career development. Databases mentioned in VI D will build networks supportive of their needs. In fact, the Task Force recommends there also be a directory for Alumni of Color, printed, maintained, and available in the Piper Center and the Alumni Relations Office but also including alumni residing outside of the United States. These proposals and a willingness to consult with international students and alumni for such suggestions will create a naturally welcoming climate on campus, as will accommodations in counseling for international students.

The fairly new Alumni Network established by Bill Green is active and considering ways to assist St. Olaf students.

Article VI. C. More Programs Like TRIO and SSS

Demand:

We demand the creation of more programs for students of color aside from TRIO/Student Support Services, which includes students who may not fit TRIO qualifications. With this, we demand that St. Olaf be prepared to facilitate the transition of first generation students by taking the following measures:

1. Bridge programs for students of color who don't qualify for TRIO.
2. Create opportunities and make them more accessible for students who do not qualify for TRIO/SSS, Federal grants and loans, McNair, or even varsity Sports, without a social security number.

PLT Response:

This demand seeks more programs for students of color. Meeting these demands would require significant new resources that have not been identified in our budget planning going forward. We think the Task Force should step back and review the support already in place for under-resourced students and students from marginalized communities and consider any recommendations they may think appropriate.

Summarized Discussion:

The Task Force suggests that St. Olaf serve undocumented students who need support but are ineligible for Trio and SSS programs. We agree with the Collective that the College

needs more bridge programs to accommodate this population, first generation students, and students of color not served currently. The Task Force spent much time discussing what happens to students whose funds dry up by the spring and on whose accounts the Registrar places holds. Students have to arrange to remove the holds. While the holds are on, students cannot register for or attend class. By the time the hold comes off, they might be inadmissible in class because the possibility of enrollment comes too late. Such a predicament compromises students' academic standing, and their ability to stay on campus or graduate on time. The College needs to find additional support for these populations but also address a tendency to drastically underfund programs that emphasize diversity.

Task Force Recommendations:

Some students cannot legally accept special funding, so they need financial assistance. Work/Study students need their pay periods to be more in sync with the dates for course registration. College fundraisers need to help students with special needs, and not just raise money for a general fund. Here the new alumni network can help as donors.

The Task Force also proposes that the Registrar extend the deadline or grace period for registration, at least in some cases. They might help students set up payment plans that induce timely payments and allow students to attend class. Perhaps, the office can propose a few registration timelines, or pay-as-you-go plans and extend their open-door policy in the Financial Aid Office for the most financial distressed students. As Carleton's Posse program manages to cover DACA and other marginalized students, we might accept advice from one or more of their offices or programs.

Article VI. D. Relations with Alumni of Color

Demand:

We demand that St. Olaf increase its resources for students of color with regards to openly building relations with alumni of color and that the following steps be met by Spring 2018.

1. Academic networking and community support for students of color, such as making Piper Center and CMIE Alumni and Students of Color an annual event. This event should continue to be open to all students on the CMIE alias.
2. A Directory for Alumni of Color should be created and maintained by the Piper Center and Alumni-Parent Relations Office.
3. A list of alumni of color currently residing outside of the U.S. should be accessible to all students of color. This could be an extension of the Directory for Alumni of Color described in Article VI, Section D, no. 2.

PLT Response:

This demand seeks connections between students and alumni of color. The College does plan to continue networking events for students and alumni of color. All Piper Center events are open to all students. Alumni are not required to share information about their

race with us. Therefore, creating a searchable database of alumni of color would require an opt-in mechanism. We will explore this possibility.

Summarized Discussion:

We discussed the need to establish networks of additional support for international and domestic students of color. Alumni have resources that they are willing to offer. New and updated databases will add to student access to them, but also extend possibilities for experiential learning, global study, employment, internships and other projects. It will enhance such services as CIMIE, the Piper Center, and other programs at St. Olaf offer. Such opportunities strengthen institutional ties and raise interests all around.

Task Force Recommendations:

This demand has ties to VI. B. The Task Force believes that increasing engagement with alumni of color will improve the retention and success of current students of color. Intentional programming and the creation of resources will enhance support and build relationships with this demographic. In addition to the St. Olaf Alumni Online Directory, a separate database should be created highlighting alumni of color and their current, as well as previous professions, and contact information, printed, maintained, and available in the Piper Center and the Alumni Relations Office. This includes all domestically and internationally located. The Piper Center should also be responsible for planning two, annual-events, that bring alumni of color back to campus, to engage with current students about opportunities on and off campus, study and employment options and share their experience seeking employment following graduation.

Article VI. E. Increase Resources for Recruiting Students of Color and a Detailed Portrayal of Demographics:

Demand:

We demand an increase in the resources allocated for the recruitment of students of color, including having more people of color working in the Office of Admissions.

1. There should also be a honest portrayal of the demographics of students that attend this institution (race/ethnicity, gender, sexuality, socioeconomic status). Refer to Article VIII, Section B.

PLT Response:

This demand seeks changes to the way students are represented in College Communications. We believe our materials do honestly portray the demographics of St. Olaf students. We are upfront about the statistics of our student body and provide them through admissions brochures and the website. Our primary admissions brochure clearly states the percentage of domestic students of color as well as international students on campus. That same information is presented on the [Admissions](#) website, and those numbers are outlined in even greater detail in the [St. Olaf Profile](#) that is posted on the

website. Our goal with all admissions materials is to highlight a wide variety of St. Olaf students and the various academic and extracurricular activities they're pursuing on campus. (**Note:** The Demand labeled as VI. E. in the original List of Demands was removed from the updated List of Demands).

Summarized Discussion:

The Task Force noted a tendency of St. Olaf to lump international with domestic students of color, which overstates the numbers of students of color admitted each year. Years ago, Admissions stopped breaking out specific demographic numbers of students. Gradually the admission of African Americans dropped to 2% and the hidden number of Native Americans fell even lower. With these populations in particular, St. Olaf seems to be moving in the wrong direction.

Task Force Recommendations:

This demand is linked to claims about St. Olaf College's Strategic Plan. The Task Force recommends clarity and transparency in admissions reports. The College needs to report numbers for national and international students, for each domestic group of students of color. St. Olaf needs to commit to raising the enrollments of the most underrepresented of these groups, reporting where in the fifty states the College goes to recruit African and Native American students. Do St. Olaf recruiters travel to urban centers, reservations, public and private schools, and suburban neighborhoods? Which of the recruitment maps have they found most useful in their efforts to improve diversity at St. Olaf? In other words, the College should study its recruitment and reporting history, including data on the intervals for hiring and promotion of recruiters in Admissions, especially recruiters of color, say, in the past 20 years. Frequent and detailed annual reporting in print and public presentations might help with truth and transparency.

Article VI. F. International Counselor Stipend

Demand:

We demand that International Student Counselors be provided a stipend.

1. They need to be paid for the weekly meetings, Spring training, Week Zero planning, counselor-planned events, etc.

PLT Response:

This demand is self-explanatory. The College had a very successful recruitment year for international students. There will be nearly a hundred international students in the Class of 2021. We are going to need to re-examine how we welcome, orient, and support them. We will fold this demand into that reconsideration.

Summarized Discussion:

During the discussion on demand VI., the Task Force explored the importance of stipends for the international counselors, and the outcomes they can have on this position. A

member of the Task Force noted that because of the significant amount of work that the international counselors do, they should be remunerated.. The Task Force also looked into the PLT response to this demand. It mentions the increased enrollment of international students in the Class of 2021, and that the resulting expansion of duties for ISOs would be part of the re-examination of how international students will be welcomed, oriented and supported. This could involve the transformation of this position to a paid job.

Task Force Recommendations:

The Task Force acknowledges the hard work that the international counselors do during week zero, planning events and welcoming students. Given their many duties, we believe they should receive stipends. In addition, this position can be extended to a year long position, during which the counselors will be in contact with their counselees regularly. These positions and their responsibilities can be determined by the CMIE office.

Article VI. G. Transparency in CMIE's Budget

Demand:

We demand for transparency in CMIE's budget, wherein finances should be accessible to all students and faculty.

1. Create a database that tracks all records of individuals/organization members that receive finances for CMIE-funded events including, but not limited to, CMIE organization events, faculty/academic department collaborations, International Student Orientation, International Student Counselor events, CMIE Program Assistant/Cultural-Immersion events, etc.
2. This database needs to be updated upon each transaction.
3. An annual report to be published by CMIE by the end of every Spring semester.

PLT Response:

This demand seeks detailed information about the resources and expenditures of CMIE. We don't understand what lies behind these demands for detailed information about the budget of a particular college program. We would like more information so that we can understand how to respond.

Summarized Discussion:

It was unclear to the Task Force exactly what was driving this demand in terms of a need for detailed information about budget and events. It was noted that there has been growth in recent years of the Center for Multicultural and International Engagement (CMIE), as both the number of international students at St. Olaf has increased as has the number of programs and administrative units under its supervision. It would be helpful to know if CMIE's budget has kept up with this growth.

Task Force Recommendations:

We recommend CMIE produce an annual report that is made available to the St. Olaf community. It should include a detailed list of the individuals/organization members that are funded. We encourage ongoing dialogue between the Collective and the PLT concerning funding, transparency, and any additional action appropriate to moving forward.

Article VII. A. New Roommate due to Discrimination

Demand:

We demand that if a student is requesting to be reassigned a new roommate due to discrimination on account of race, religion, gender and/or sexuality, such requests be dealt with and responded to immediately. The perpetrator must then be removed from the room/house to not inconvenience the victim further.

PLT Response:

This demand seeks improvements in addressing housing conflict related to bias and discrimination. See the Task Force response to demand VII. B.

Summarized Discussion:

Demands VII.A. and VII.B are related to Demand V.B., so see our discussion of V.B. above.

The Task Force looked into these demands and decided more information is needed before providing recommendations for the two sections. A member of the Task Force contacted Pamela McDowell, Associate Dean of Students for Residence Life, for insights.

Here are the verbatim email questions asked of Pamela McDowell and her responses:

1. How often do instances come about where a student asks for a different roommate or to be moved because of discrimination against their race, religion, gender and sexuality, etc?

We have an average of 50 room changes a year where someone is unhappy in the rooming situation. Not everyone fully discloses why they want a room change – but those that do would be less than 10.

2. When accusations are made, does an "investigation" occur to determine whether the alleged perpetrator did something inappropriate?

First we ask if the student wants us to move forward with a conduct case or follow up with the roommate(s) informally (non conduct) case.

3. If yes, how does this investigation get carried out?

The Area Coordinator or I would meet with all students involved, including witnesses. Ask for any texts or social media screen shots that would be relevant as well. Then make a determination if the Code of Conduct was violated.

4. Who is asked to leave the room if the perpetrator is found at fault? How is this determined? How do you decide a new living situation for the victim and the perpetrator?

Usually someone has moved before someone is found at fault. But if everyone is still living together, part of the sanction may be that the person found responsible needs to move. If someone is moving and we need to find housing I give the student a list of openings on campus – in case they know someone on the list.

5. Are perpetrators of racism withheld from potential roommate lists?

Not in all cases - if I am working one-on-one with a student I may withhold the name because I probably already know if they know the person or not from our conversation. In large group situations where the email is going to 50 people I may not because they may know someone on the list who wants to room with them.

Task Force Recommendations:

As discussed above in V. B., we believe the College should adopt a more comprehensive approach to responding to any reports of discrimination or bias, similar to the manner in which the College responds to reports of sexual misconduct under Title IX. This should include a process for resolving roommate conflicts arising from other forms of prohibited discrimination or harassing behavior. When such conflicts arise, the College should be prepared to immediately provide interim protective measures, including providing alternative rooming arrangements when the conflict involves roommates or other students living in close proximity. The College should explore ways to ensure that when room changes are implemented, this is done in a manner that is fair for both the reporting party and the accused. We agree that moving a student to a new living space can feel punitive, and when violations of College policy are determined to have occurred, it is the perpetrator who should be the presumptive party to relocate. Because such misconduct has serious deleterious impacts upon the community, we believe the College should explore removing perpetrators from the campus entirely as a sanction to ensure that no other students experience similar conduct.

Article VII. B. Potential Roommates

Demand:

We demand that the Director of Residence Life withhold the names of reported perpetrators when offering a list of potential roommates to the victim.

PLT Response:

We recommend that the Task Force step back and look overall at how housing policies and practices at the College might be revised in light of concerns about climate as expressed in demands VII. A, B, and C. (**Note:** The original demand VII. A. on gender-neutral housing was

removed from the updated version of the List of Demands, so the original VII. B and VII. C. are here listed as VII. A. and VII. B. The PLT Response to VII. A. has accordingly been edited to reflect this as well).

Summarized Discussion:

See V. B. and VII. A. above

Task Force Recommendations:

We support this demand. If perpetrators are permitted to reside on campus the College needs to take steps to avoid re-victimization of others, especially individuals who have experienced similar discrimination or harassment. In circumstances where a victim expresses a desire to relocate, the College should take steps to ensure that newly assigned roommates have not engaged in similar misconduct in the past.

Article VIII. A. Permission for Marketing Release

Demand:

We demand that all students, specifically marginalized students, give permission before the marketing department releases any multimedia imagery, film, or quotes from these students.

PLT Response:

This demand is self-explanatory. We obtain permission from students we profile. It is our regular practice to allow them to review their quotes and profiles before we post or print them. We take many photographs on our campus to be used on our website and other materials. If we receive a request from a student who happens to be in a photo who doesn't want to be included, we honor that request.

We include information about how we use photographs and other visual images on the Registrar's Office web page [as part of the guidelines for the release of student information under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act]. We agree that this information can be difficult to find, and we commit to more clearly communicating this information to students and providing them with information on how they can opt out.

Summarized Discussion:

Members of the Task Force discussed the representation of students of color at St. Olaf. Given their small numbers, some students complained that they are over-represented in marketing and other materials. The Task Force recognized the College's need to promote itself, but also considered problems with inaccurate representations and the need for more dialogues among all College stakeholders.

Task Force Recommendations:

The College should honor requests from students who do not want to be included in marketing materials. The College should explore ways to more clearly communicate guidelines for use of photographs and other visual images and identify for students a clear process for opting out. The College's Marketing and Communications (MARCOM) and the Registrar's Office need to discuss additional options with other stakeholders.

Article VIII B. Marketing Rhetoric Change:*Demand:*

We demand that St. Olaf College's marketing department change the rhetoric used on their website. This includes adding captions to the picture, giving photo credits, which mainly cites the location and year of the image. Also, acknowledging that the majority of the study abroad programs are in western Europe and North America, and reflecting that on the study abroad marketing materials.

PLT Response:

This demand seeks changes to the rhetoric of the St. Olaf website and a specific way to describe off-campus study programs. We are in the process of redesigning the website. Our marketing team will be working collaboratively with the International and Off Campus Studies Office to refresh their content on their web page.

Summarized Discussion:

The Task Force recognizes the College's need to attract students, faculty and staff and Marketing's goal of branding and selling St. Olaf to the public. Besides recruitment tools, we discussed the challenge of representing the College to the public. Our wide-ranging discussion covered such questions as how St. Olaf comments on the protest last spring, whether in the past it over-represented students of color, if Marketing consults members of the community who might comment on accuracy and appeal, if the stakeholders raising any questions at all suggests a tendency to micro-manage the experts. This latter question led to issues of transparency, management styles, campus climate, diversity, inclusion and retention or sustained engagement. We repeated our recommendation of on-going training in cultural sensitivity. Much overlaps questions of representation. We also viewed Marketing's new video *Oles Can, Oles Will*.

Task Force Recommendations:

The Task Force supports the use of captions or headings for images and encourage the use of them with the redesign of the St. Olaf website that will be launching this fall. It is important to recognize that the St. Olaf website is decentralized. It is a multi-site platform with over 200 administrators who each have the ability to edit the content that appears on the site controlled by their own individual department, office or program. Divisions of the College that project images of St. Olaf to the public should incorporate images of what the College does well, like display campus beauty, engaging class discussions, and key events.

We support transparency in the communications about the College's international study abroad programs, including identifying where study abroad opportunities are located.

A Closing Vision

The Task Force on Institutional Racism at St. Olaf College acknowledges the Collective's care and concern for the College in generating the thoughtful demands for change that it presented to the President and the President's Leadership Team. Members of the Collective for Change on the Hill examined closely an array of historical patterns of racist conduct on campus. They also outlined in detail twenty-seven demands important to altering our campus climate. Members of the Task Force owe some of their richest investments of time, intellect, and passion to the example of truthful and transparent reflection on life at St. Olaf that students in the Collective set. Honest self-reflection can be painful at times, but real honesty is a gift. The Task Force strove to prove worthy of it.

The gift that the Collective gave the beloved community is one of sight. They shed light on the dysfunction in our family. They exposed to the light the racism that periodically flared up in our midst. They documented the fact that one can trace this problem to the origins of campus life, but also demonstrate how often it has gone ignored. Systemic racism has proven so easy to deny at St. Olaf. This is why the Collective's contribution to the College proves courageous and ultimately charitable, for those who protest believe that social justice is possible, that our climate of racism can be fixed once people can see the necessity of addressing it.

In part, the charge of the Task Force on Institutional Racism is to accept the Collective's gift to St. Olaf College and to extend the community's gaze. Eight people came together over the summer to examine twenty-seven demands, very carefully worded and thoughtfully considered so as to actually alter structures of racism on our hill. The hardest thing to do when many deny the realities that some here face is to simply look at what is there. Looking, one stands a chance of seeing, and seeing one can make a response, an honest one. The particulars of each demand warrant close attention, but taken together, they urgently call the College to truth and transparency in acknowledging the cost of hate speech and hate crimes against marginalized members of the St. Olaf community.

Members of the Task Force recognize the courage it takes to honestly look at our institutional flaws. In a climate of denial buttressed by a culture of Minnesota nice and shored up by statements about the College's Christian identity, it costs something to confront our social dysfunctions. Those who name injustices at St. Olaf take real risks. Some may even suffer harsh code violations. Still, it is a credit to the College that those responsible for recruitment attracted such honorable students. The Task Force attempted to follow the trail that they blazed last spring, and to guide the rest of the community along their moral path.

The charge of the Task Force is not only to help members of the St. Olaf community to perceive the institutional racism causing dysfunction in our midst, but also to move from denials or defensive reactions to proactive remedies to the Collective's demands, generated since the student protest last spring. With acknowledgement and recommendations for change come opportunities for repairing ills and reconciling relationships. The Task Force on Institutional Racism believes that we cannot have shared community without truth and transparency. Armed with a commitment to address institutional racism, a willingness to change, and specific recommendations that improve the quality of life for everyone on the hill, the whole St. Olaf community can move forward.

This was and is our chief goal as members of the Task Force on Institutional Racism.

We faced difficulties as disparate members of the Task Force, so our process proved far from easy. It took time to build community, to do so of necessity, and to agree to disagree about the Collective's demands. We had to decide on our approach to them, discuss whether members of the Collective could attend meetings, choose which demands to address first, even whether to change the name of the Task Force, and to keep or expunge every reference to race or racism in the minutes and by extension in our report. We also considered whether to release periodic summaries of our work to the public, and whether we could control our narrative. We did not always agree about the urgency of a demand or how we might respond. Sometimes our conflicting perceptions and different stories stirred deep emotions, some accounts sounding unbelievable or the responses to them harsh. At times the remedies we discussed and the diction we used gave some pause. Clearly, we had our hands full.

Despite our differences, we became a working group, a community who could compromise, listen, hear, and appreciate the contributions that each Task Force member brought to our meetings. We valued every voice, took seriously each session, and always worked hard. Seeing how much time it took to think and talk through each demand and administrator response, and knowing that we had a September 1 deadline for the Task Force report, we agreed that our work only marked a beginning. Nevertheless, hard pressed to meet our goal, we stayed the course, focused on what we shared in common.

The St. Olaf mission statement indicates what that is. It reads, "St. Olaf College challenges students to excel in the liberal arts, examine faith and values, and explore meaningful vocation in an inclusive, globally engaged community nourished by Lutheran tradition." Here we are all called to an established set of values, called to examine ourselves, called to find our places in the world, and called to make significant contributions wherever we are. We desire to engage with others, which is why the College is up to the challenge of truthfully and transparently addressing the demands of the Collective. Because their members demanded a heartfelt response, the Task Force devoted pages to its frank response, doing so in recognition of urgent honesty. To the spark that the

Collective ignited last spring, the Task Force added its flame, the kind that one associates with pioneer hearths and homes.

The path to genuine community proves painful before one climbs to a clearing. Truths spoken before age-old fires around which one sits listening to stories--all demand human presence and patient acceptance of the textures and timbres of other voices. Here sounds braid together, wrapping in safety all who are seated in a circle of light. When we recall the fire's warm glow, all anyone will see is a tableau of family members. Imagine such a projection of St. Olaf College spanning the globe!

Signed by,

Associate Professor Joan Hepburn, Department of English (Co-Chair)

Associate Professor Chris Chiappari, Department of Sociology/Anthropology (Co-Chair)

SuSu Almousa '19, Atefeh Alavi '20, Yishu Dai '18 (Students)

Thomas Fiebiger '78, Sheridan Blanford '15 (Alumni)