



Report to the Community

May 1, 2018

Working Group on Equity and Inclusion

St. Olaf College

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	2
Glossary	4
Where St. Olaf Stands Today.....	6
Process.....	II
Recommendations.....	16
Climate and community.....	17
Sustainability.....	21
Access and inclusion.....	25
Scholarship and learning	28
Institutional commitment.....	30
Conclusion.....	33
Appendix A: Working Group Members	34
Appendix B: Timeline.....	35
Appendix C: St. Olaf Diversity Initiatives	37
Appendix D: Social Justice in Higher Education – From Awareness to Action	39
Appendix E: Campus Living, Learning, and Working Environment Survey Executive Summary	44
Appendix F: Microaggressions Survey Executive Summaries	49
Appendix G: References	60

INTRODUCTION

St. Olaf College has begun a journey to increase diversity, foster inclusion, and challenge bias on its campus. St. Olaf's student body has been instrumental in pushing the college forward on this journey and has reminded us of the amount of work we have ahead if we are to be the community we claim to be. During spring 2017, a campus-wide protest and sit-in – in response to a series of racist incidents – disrupted spring academic routines on campus. At the protest, students shared their outrage, fears, anger and frustration, illuminating experiences of individual and institutional racism at St. Olaf. Many students, faculty and staff on our campus expressed feeling unwelcomed – a situation that desperately needs to be addressed.

A new student movement called the Collective for Change on the Hill (referred to in the following pages as the Collective) brought forward a list of [demands](#) to the President, his leadership team, and the Board of Regents, along with a process for addressing concerns about systemic racism and the lack of inclusion at St. Olaf. Included in the process was the formation of a faculty-led Task Force on Institutional Racism (referred to in the following pages as the Task Force) to review the Collective's demands, assess the college's response to those demands, and make any additional [recommendations](#). The Working Group on Equity and Inclusion, which was formed after these efforts, recognizes and affirms the importance of the work of the Collective and the Task Force in elevating issues of racism, diversity and inclusion to the highest level at the college.

St. Olaf's work toward equity and inclusion is a fundamental part of its identity and vocation as a college of the Lutheran tradition. The Bible proclaims (Genesis 1:26) that every human being is created in God's image and likeness. On the basis of this truth, Lutheran values affirm the equal dignity and worth of all people. Racism, based as it is on the unequal worth of human beings, denies and betrays these values, and we reject its presence in our community. For the same reason, St. Olaf must reject injustice and oppression based on gender, class and identity. The Lutheran tradition calls individuals and communities to work for justice and to love and serve one another with respect, compassion and joy. St. Olaf must continually reclaim and commit to these values as a part of its mission as an institution "nourished by the Lutheran tradition."

The work of creating an inclusive and welcoming campus for students of different cultures, races, genders, social identities, socio-economic backgrounds, religions, and political ideologies is complex, challenging and nuanced. All people have equal value and dignity and have the right to be treated with respect; however, hateful and destructive ideologies, such as those based on racism or xenophobia, are not welcome. We hope the recommendations outlined in this report help move St. Olaf beyond demographic diversity to true equity and inclusion.

We recognize that our Working Group is just one step in an ongoing process toward long-term change for our community. Formed in a moment of crisis, we acknowledge the present and historical pain in our community, and we resolve to create an ongoing space to heal and build trust as a community.

Our *principal recommendation*, therefore, is to form a permanent St. Olaf Council on Equity and Inclusion to carry this work forward, address ongoing structural, institutional and individual biases that impede this work, and transform St. Olaf into a genuinely inclusive, equitable community.

Imperative to creating a diverse and welcoming community is the development of a strategic diversity and inclusion plan. This plan should be woven into the fabric of the college's strategic plan, and not considered merely as a series of new, parallel initiatives. St. Olaf's strategic plan is central to how the college directs its work as an institution and its mission to be "an inclusive, globally engaged community." The diversity and inclusion plan must also become institutionalized and central to the mission of the college. Moreover, St. Olaf will need to commit the necessary financial resources, human capacity, and leadership required to make this plan an effective and enduring force for change at the college. We expect the Board of Regents to monitor and hold the college accountable to ensure that the strategic diversity and inclusion plan is fully adopted and successfully implemented.

Our goal is to make significant and lasting changes at St. Olaf. We understand that change can be challenging and may elicit resistance. But we cannot disregard the fact that people on our campus from all walks of life are feeling real pain.

The recommendations outlined in this report were released to President Anderson, the Board of Regents, and the general public on May 1, 2018. We encourage you to provide your feedback directly to President Anderson and his leadership team.

Principal recommendations

1. Create the St. Olaf Council on Equity and Inclusion
2. Develop a strategic diversity and inclusion plan that is woven into the fabric of the college's strategic plan
3. Commit necessary leadership and financial and human resources to achieve the recommendations.

GLOSSARY

The Working Group aims to be clear and inclusive throughout our writing. Though it is not exhaustive, this glossary is intended to help clarify the terminology used throughout our report.

Cultural competence: Cultural competence is having an awareness of one’s own cultural identity and views about difference, and the ability to learn and build on the varying cultural and community norms of students and their families. It is the ability to understand the within-group differences that make each person unique, while celebrating the between-group variations that make our country a tapestry. This understanding informs and expands teaching practices in the culturally competent educator’s classroom. *(National Education Association)*

Inclusion: Authentically bringing traditionally excluded individuals and/or groups into processes, activities, and decision/policy making in a way that shares power. *(“Glossary,” [Racial Equity Tools](#))*

Institutional racism: The ways in which policies and practices of organizations or parts of systems (e.g., schools, courts, transportation authorities) create different outcomes for different racial groups. The institutional policies may never mention any racial group, but their effect is to create, maintain or fail to remedy accumulated advantages for white people and accumulated disadvantages for people from other racial groups. *(“Core Concepts,” [Racial Equity Tools](#))*

Intersectionality: An understanding of human beings as shaped by the interaction of different social locations (e.g., race/ethnicity, indigeneity, gender, class, sexuality, geography, age, disability/ability, migration status, religion). These interactions occur within a context of connected systems and structures of power (e.g., laws, policies, state governments, and other political and economic unions, religious institutions, media). Through such interactions and systems, interdependent forms of privilege and oppression shaped by colonialism, imperialism, racism, homophobia, ableism, and patriarchy are created. *(Olena Hankivsky, Simon Fraser University Associate Professor of Political Science; Adjunct Professor of Women’s Studies)*

Microaggressions: Brief, everyday exchanges that send denigrating messages to certain individuals because of their group membership. *(Roundtable on Community Change, The Aspen Institute)*

Microinvalidations: Unconscious microaggressions that ignore, neutralize or negate the lived experience and emotional realities of racially, ethnically and nationally underrepresented persons. *(Roundtable on Community Change, The Aspen Institute)*

Racial equity: A society where the distribution of benefits and burdens are not skewed by race. In other words, racial equity is a reality in which a person is no more or less likely to experience society’s benefits or burdens just because of the color of their skin. This is in contrast to the current state of affairs in which a person of color is more likely to live in poverty, be imprisoned, drop out of high school, be unemployed and experience poor health outcomes like diabetes, heart disease, depression and other potentially fatal diseases. Racial equity holds society to a higher standard. It demands that we pay attention not just to

individual-level discrimination, but to overall social outcomes. (*Roundtable on Community Change, The Aspen Institute*)

Social justice: Social justice is both a process and a goal. It requires full and equal participation of all groups in a society that is mutually shaped to meet their needs and includes a vision of society that is equitable and where all members are physically and psychologically safe and secure. (*Teaching for Diversity and Social Justice: A Sourcebook. Edited by Maurianne Adams, Lee Anne Bell, and Pat Griffin*)

Structural or systemic racism: The normalized and legitimized range of policies, practices and attitudes that routinely produce cumulative privilege for whites and chronically produce adverse outcomes for people of color, especially blacks. (*Center for the Study of Race and ethnicity in America, Brown University*)

WHERE ST. OLAF STANDS TODAY

St. Olaf's [mission](#) calls for the college to be “an inclusive, globally engaged community,” where people of diverse backgrounds, experiences, identities and ideas come together in a spirit of mutual respect and participation. As a college of the church, dismantling racism is fundamental to our mission. However, the college's mission is not being realized for all members of our community. Students, faculty and staff across the campus shared experiences that showed discrimination, intolerance, and a lack of civility on campus. Honoring the worth of each individual and recognizing the unique and diverse lived experiences of our students, faculty and staff is a moral imperative. While creating and maintaining this spirit is crucial to a healthy community and to our work as educators, it is also, unequivocally, critical to the ongoing survival of the college.

- Equity and inclusion efforts are a fundamental part of our mission. We want to invest in and cultivate the talents of people from all backgrounds, especially those who have historically had less access to higher education.
- Research conducted by Pomona College supports the proposition that learning is most transformative in a context of deep engagement with diverse perspectives around substantive issues.
- Cultural sensitivity, empathy, and shared experiences gained in a diverse student body, and exposure to a broad curriculum will give all students important tools to succeed in an increasingly diverse country and interdependent world.
- A diverse student body is necessary for recruiting today's college-bound young people. St. Olaf will lose potential and highly attractive candidates if the college is not perceived as a welcoming and diverse community.
- The shifting demographics in our country, especially in the Midwest, compels St. Olaf to continue its focus on expanding our campus to include students of diverse ethnicities, races, backgrounds, and lived experiences. In the next three decades, the United States is projected to become a majority-minority nation, meaning that more than 50% of the population will come from historically underrepresented groups.

Over the past several years, St. Olaf has taken significant steps to increase the diversity of the student body, faculty, and staff members. In 2011, the college adopted a strategic goal of increasing diversity enrollment by 1% a year. The class of 2021, which started their first year at St. Olaf this academic year, is the most diverse class in the college's history, with 20% of the class being domestic students of color and 12% being international students. The racial and ethnic diversity at St. Olaf is on par with national statistics, but below our national peer colleges. According to [College Factual](#), 25.6% of the student body is non-white or international. The racial and ethnic diversity of our faculty, however, remains an area requiring improvement as the college ranks below the national average. According to [College Factual](#), 14.5% of the faculty is non-white or international.

In just the last year, the college has taken important steps to address issues of inclusion and equity on campus. This includes launching *To Include is To Excel*, which is aimed at developing innovative curricula to better serve a new generation of students; implementing diversity training for all students, faculty and staff; updating the process for reporting bias incidents; and working on other short-term and long-term strategies.

St. Olaf administrators are considering and/or implementing several efforts to improve equity and inclusion, including:

- Modifying the faculty search process to require candidates to offer a diversity statement
- Changing qualifications for entry-level positions to attract a more diverse pool of applicants
- Training public safety officers on implicit bias; hate crime and bias incident investigations; and trauma-informed interviewing
- Encouraging students to think about inclusion when planning events and to collaborate with organizations to reach a wide range of students
- Requiring student organizations to have St. Olaf's non-discrimination clause included in their constitution
- Adding an Inclusivity Advocate position to Residence Hall Councils, a position dedicated to ensuring events and initiatives are accessible and inclusive, and facilitating dialogue at meetings about social identities

A full list of programs and initiatives is available in Appendix C. It is important to note that these initiatives alone do not make the campus inclusive or equitable for all, but we are encouraged by these efforts.

To Include is To Excel

[*To Include is To Excel*](#) is an initiative to examine and improve course offerings and modes of teaching so that St. Olaf can best serve new generations of students. The four-year, faculty-student-staff collaborative project is helping the college gain deep and nuanced knowledge about how our increasingly diverse students learn and how to promote inclusive pedagogies in classrooms.

With the understanding that excellence, inclusion and equity are inextricably entwined, the initiative strives to:

- Gain a deeper understanding of students and their progress through the general education curricula and major fields of study, which will synthesize and enhance current findings reported by St. Olaf's Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness.
- Pilot innovative approaches in teaching and curricular design and assess their outcomes.
- Integrate findings about student learning and motivations into ongoing curricular review and innovation.
- Share and compare St. Olaf discoveries with colleagues at collaborating institutions.

To Include is To Excel is funded with an \$800,000 grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.

St. Olaf faces an ongoing challenge, common to many other institutions, as we work to transform the community. While working to diversify our student body, faculty and staff, the college did not fully comprehend the magnitude of the challenges, change and emotional response that would result from transforming a relatively homogenous community – much less a community that exhibits as much pride of place, history and heritage as St. Olaf.

At this point, the St. Olaf community consists of a large enough percentage of people whose identities and lived experiences are different from those in the college's historical community that the campus has started to *feel* different. Rather than expecting newcomers to learn to adjust to the ways of the community, we are beginning to understand that in order to welcome people, we need to commit to changing ourselves and our community.

In short, the demographics of the college changed while the institution and campus culture did not. We have continued to be a place created for some, while hoping to be a place where all members, new and old, can feel ownership, pride, acceptance and belonging.

We know that this changing dynamic has caused real pain for students, faculty and staff at St. Olaf, and we have learned that the experiences and impacts are broader and deeper than we thought. Students have reported several incidents of verbal slights in and out of the classroom. These expressions – or microaggressions – are often not intended to hurt and are carried out with little conscious awareness of

The national context

By Rev. Dr. Jamie Washington

St. Olaf is not alone. Colleges and universities across the country are grappling with how to ensure that their campuses are a welcome place for everyone. The first step many institutions took was to address access – making sure that students and faculty from diverse backgrounds were able to attend and teach at their institution. However, as their student bodies became more diverse, many schools were slower to change their institutional cultures. While an individual or an institution may value equity, they may unconsciously behave in discriminatory ways. We all bring our own experiences and cultural history to each interaction, and the unconscious biases that result can lead to an unwelcoming campus climate.

What we are seeing today at campuses nationwide is an inherent tension that comes from an increased number of students from different cultural, ethnic and racial backgrounds in environments where the culture is based primarily on the experiences of white students. It is imperative that access and culture changes go hand in hand.

Institutions must move beyond the diversity numbers game and take intentional and deliberate actions to acknowledge and examine the systemic processes that may unconsciously promote structural racism and engage both dominant and subordinated groups in creating processes and communities that truly promote equity and inclusion. We need to move beyond comfort zones and make decisions to change the status quo.

their meanings and effects. Nevertheless, their accumulation over a lifetime is in part what defines a marginalized experience.

We learned from the Collective and the Task Force, as well as from individual students, faculty and staff, that there are campus climate problems, including anger, frustration and warranted impatience, resulting from systemic and institutional racism, bigotry, ignorance, and a lack of cultural competence. Over time, these factors have eroded the level of trust and transparency among and between various constituencies on campus and their relationship with the college's leadership. Students, faculty and staff want a deeper engagement with race and racism at the interpersonal and institutional levels.

Changing culture in a sustainable, intentional way is very difficult. There is no simple solution for transforming St. Olaf's culture immediately. The college needs to create time and space for healing, listening and empathy, something that our culture and diversity expert Rev. Dr. Jamie Washington helped start this winter. St. Olaf needs to conduct a deep examination of structural barriers to equity and inclusion, not only at the institutional level, but also in our St. Olaf traditions and culture. The college needs to ensure that voices of marginalized groups are always at the table. And St. Olaf must develop and foster the capacity of our community to handle difficult and sometimes uncomfortable discussions across difference – in and outside the classroom.

Rev. Dr. Washington advised us that sustainable culture change happens over time. There are typically three phases. First, college leadership needs to buy-in to the process and develop the organizational structure to support the culture change. Second, the college must build the capacity to accomplish culture change through strategic planning, training, policy review, and transparent communications. Finally, St. Olaf needs to establish an accountability system with consequences and rewards, to shift policies and practices, and to continually reassess and revise its strategy on equity and inclusion.

In the face of insufficient progress and with compelling reasons to move forward, the Working Group believes St. Olaf must renew its commitment to equity and inclusion with a sense of urgency. Diversifying the student body, faculty and staff to be in line with demographic shifts in the United States is just one piece of the puzzle. The other, and arguably most important piece is to make substantive cultural and structural changes. To this end, the Working Group submits this report as a set of recommendations, with significant policy implications, that describes how St. Olaf's stated mission to be an inclusive and equitable community can begin to be fully actualized.

St. Olaf is a community of diverse beliefs, ideas and identities, and we heard many perspectives through this process. We expect that there may be many responses to the Working Group's recommendations, and we encourage you to submit feedback and continue engaging with these important issues. We recognize that the work of creating an equitable and inclusive St. Olaf will never be complete. We must continue to assess, challenge and improve as a college and as a community.

Our report requires strong leadership from senior administrative leaders, calls for rigorous policy-making, goal-setting and analysis, and depends on the Board of Regents to hold the college accountable. If St. Olaf

creates a strategic equity and inclusion plan and ambitiously pursues this plan in the spirit of continuous improvement and shared accountability, we believe that St. Olaf will become a stronger college and one that better serves our diverse community.

PROCESS

Beginning in the fall of 2017, the Working Group faced a large and important task – identifying ways to ensure that diversity, equity and inclusion are central, not tangential, to St. Olaf’s mission. We took on this task knowing there were no easy answers; that the work would be messy, difficult and emotional; and that we would need to create space to talk about difficult issues and address them in thoughtful, comprehensive and transparent ways. We were not looking for quick and easy solutions; we were looking for long-term, effective and sustainable ones.

Throughout the school year, we listened to the community’s concerns, opinions and ideas; asked for help from experts; researched best practices at other educational institutions; conducted a climate survey; and sought to build trust within our community. We strove to balance the community’s desire for urgency with the need to be thoughtful and purposeful as we developed our recommendations. We recognize that our efforts were sometimes lacking and acknowledge that we have learned a great deal about trust, authenticity and community along the way.

In an effort to develop the trust of the St. Olaf community, the Working Group committed to being transparent in our review. Meeting summaries and other communications were posted on the [Working Group’s website](#) and emailed periodically to nearly 1,000 people.

Formation of the Working Group

In its report to the community, the Task Force on Institutional Racism recognized that more voices needed to be brought into the conversation. President Anderson agreed, and he formed an independent Working Group on Equity and Inclusion focus on identifying ways to ensure and sustain a welcoming and inclusive environment for everyone on the Hill.

Appointed by President Anderson, the 11-member Working Group included students, faculty, staff, alumni, members of the Board of Regents, and diversity and inclusion experts. Each member brought unique skills, knowledge and experiences that helped us approach this work in a nuanced way. While we all had varying degrees of experience with diversity and inclusion efforts, we shared a strong common desire to advocate for an environment where students, faculty and staff have an equal opportunity to flourish as full participants in all the college offers.

As we began meeting with the community, we focused our work on learning about institutional and systemic barriers that exist for underrepresented groups as well as individual incidents of bias or racism. We also searched for a process that could lead to long-term, sustainable, and institutional cultural change across the entire college. Evolving into an inclusive community is dynamic and complex, and we recognize that we were not able to engage with all the diverse groups at St. Olaf. Clearly, this work needs to continue.

We recognize that some stakeholders on campus questioned the way the Working Group was formed and the way members were selected. As we gained a deeper knowledge and understanding of systemic racism, we learned that even our process of forming groups like this and how we began to operate might have replicated institutional inequities. We also want to be clear that despite being formed by President Anderson, we are a fully independent group. In fact, the Working Group was funded through grant money from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation so that we could conduct our own research and hire our own outside experts.

Most importantly, we know that the Working Group is just one step in a process toward a long-term solution. We encourage St. Olaf to move forward in a spirit of collaboration with those who have come before us and those who will come after us to address these important issues.

Charge

On September 25, 2017, President Anderson charged the Working Group with the following tasks:

- Conduct a comprehensive review of the way persons from underrepresented groups experience life at St. Olaf with an eye to identifying the reasons why they experience it in this way.
- Assess the overall climate of the college as it relates to the full participation and inclusion of underrepresented members of our community, ensuring that diverse backgrounds and perspectives are included, and voices of all are heard.
- Identify barriers that exist to members of our community experiencing a consistent sense of belonging and to recommend ways to eliminate those barriers.
- Consider best practices of other colleges and universities as they relate to access, equity and inclusion.
- Provide informed and specific recommendations to the President by May 1, 2018.

We acknowledge this charge was wide-ranging, and that, in our limited time, we may have only scratched the surface on some of the issues put before us. We encourage President Anderson, the President's Leadership Team, future advisory bodies, and everyone in our community to continue to examine these important issues, identify barriers that exist for underrepresented groups, and find ways to overcome them.

Development

At our first meeting, the Working Group participated in a workshop titled Beyond Diversity 101: Micro-inequities, Implicit Bias, and Moving toward Equity. The workshop was led by Anne Phibbs, the founder and president of [Strategic Diversity Initiatives](#). She helped us gain a common knowledge to move forward in this work together and challenged us to consider the ways in which our own social identities impact how we move in this world. The workshop gave us a baseline of the concepts and evolving language relevant to diversity and social identities on the college campuses of today.

The workshop also prompted important discussion among Working Group members, and several themes emerged that helped guide our work:

- Listening builds trust.
- Our approach needs to be strategic and sustainable.
- Diversity, equity and inclusion are about creating community and addressing systems of oppression, institutional discrimination, and individual prejudice.

Outside expertise

The Working Group hired [Rev. Dr. Jamie Washington](#), a highly respected expert in multicultural organization development, to provide outside expertise and counsel for our work. He has served as an educator, administrator, and consultant in higher education for more than 30 years and has helped both corporate and nonprofit organizations work toward long-term, sustainable cultural change. Rev. Dr. Washington was a great resource in helping us reach key constituencies in our efforts to bring ideas of social justice to the forefront and become more inclusive.

Rev. Dr. Washington visited campus several times this spring to meet with students and stakeholders on campus. He facilitated conversations that helped the community move forward in the process of healing – acknowledging and processing our past and present, and helping us design the right future for St. Olaf.

Rev. Dr. Washington also played an instrumental role in bringing together the Working Group, the Collective, the Task Force, and President Anderson. Assembling this group of stakeholders was critical in creating a space for deep, authentic conversations; beginning the process of building trust and real relationships; exploring where we have been, where we are, and where we want to be; and sharing outcomes we hope to see as this effort moves forward.

His knowledge and expertise remain important in our effort to build a community and campus climate that is welcoming to all. His analysis of what a socially just institution of higher learning looks like is particularly timely for St. Olaf (see Appendix D). We are grateful for his counsel. If the college is to transform itself into a truly inclusive and equitable community of learners and scholars, St. Olaf would be well-served to follow Rev. Dr. Washington's call to action.

Additionally, the Working Group hired Sarah Carlsen '89 to serve as a project manager for the Working Group. Carlsen is a well-respected expert in developing effective leaders and powerful teams within challenging environments. She was instrumental in helping the group stay on task and coalesce as we worked towards common goals.

Surveys

To start our work and to have a baseline of the campus climate, we felt it was necessary to assess the community's attitudes, behaviors and experiences regarding inclusiveness. We retained the [Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium](#) to conduct *The Campus Living, Learning, and Working Environment Survey*, which was distributed to all students, faculty and staff in November. The survey found that while

most participants felt some sense of belonging at St. Olaf, the majority perceive that historically marginalized people at the college do not share that same sense of belonging. The survey also indicated that the greatest degree of discomfort across all groups surveyed is with people of other political viewpoints. (An executive summary is available in Appendix E.)

The survey results provided some insight, but many in our community felt the survey tool itself was problematic in the way it framed questions about incidents of discrimination. We interpreted these results with caution and understand that statistics alone cannot accurately reflect the lived experiences of racism and discrimination.

The Working Group also had access to *Racial Microaggressions in the Classroom and Curriculum*, research conducted by students in Assistant Professor of Sociology and Anthropology Ryan Sheppard's 371 class with assistance from the *To Include is To Excel* grant. The student researchers examined survey responses from more than 700 St. Olaf students. The survey demonstrated the extent of experienced microaggressions at St. Olaf – 86.5% of students reported being negatively impacted to some degree by microaggressions in the classroom. In their findings, the students recommended evaluating general education requirements to ensure that all students experience curricula that centers voices from racially and ethnically marginalized groups, and training students, faculty and staff on identifying and addressing microaggressions, among other recommendations. We are grateful to these students' powerful insights into their experiences. (An executive summary is available in Appendix F.)

Stakeholder meetings

A crucial element of our charge was to conduct a comprehensive review of the campus community and climate as it relates to diversity and inclusion. We began listening to the St. Olaf community through a series of individual meetings and large-group forums. We also received and reviewed input from dozens of students, alumni, faculty, staff and parents who shared their concerns and feedback through a confidential online form. There was an overwhelming response from people wanting to engage with the Working Group. Their willingness to share their experiences and provide input was invaluable to our process.

Over the past seven months, the Working Group and/or Rev. Dr. Washington met with the following groups:

- The Collective for Change on the Hill
- The Task Force on Institutional Racism
- President David Anderson
- President's Leadership Team, including individual meetings with Director of Athletics Ryan Bowles, Dean of Students Roz Eaton, Chief Diversity Officer Bruce King, Vice President for Enrollment and College Relations Michael Kyle, and Provost Marci Sortor
- Center for Multicultural and International Engagement
- Race and Ethnic Studies department
- *To Include is To Excel* leadership

- GLOW (Gay, Lesbian or Whatever) (Rev. Dr. Washington meeting on January 17)
- St. Olaf Economics Club and Turning Point (politically conservative organizations)
- Institute of Freedom and Community
- Faculty and staff of color (Rev. Dr. Washington meeting on January 17)
- Student forums (Rev. Dr. Washington facilitated a forum on January 17 and the Student Government Association hosted a forum with the Working Group on April 26)
- Faculty forum (Rev. Dr. Washington facilitated a forum on January 18)
- Open office hours (April 11, April 12, April 16, April 18, and April 24)
- Sociology/Anthropology 371 class (student research on Racial Microaggressions in the Classroom and Curriculum)

We acknowledge we were unable to meet with everyone, and we encourage future advisory bodies to continue this listening and learning process. Our recommendations below encourage St. Olaf to develop an ongoing feedback loop so that its inclusion and equity work can be continuously refined and expanded.

Best practices

Colleges and universities across the country are addressing issues of diversity, equity and inclusion, just like St. Olaf. Many institutions have also established a dedicated working group or advisory body to make recommendations to further inclusion and equity efforts on campus. We acknowledge that strategies implemented at other higher education institutions must be adapted for the specific culture and environment at St. Olaf, but a review of these various efforts nevertheless proved useful. In addition to reviewing relevant academic research, the Working Group considered initiatives and strategic plans from a variety of institutions across the country, including:

- Augsburg College
- Carleton College
- Cornell University
- Dartmouth University
- Earlham College
- Emory University
- Gustavus Adolphus College
- Luther College
- Macalester College
- Northwestern University
- Pacific Lutheran University
- Pomona College
- Princeton University
- Smith College
- University of California, Berkeley
- University of Minnesota

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Working Group on Equity and Inclusion offers the following recommendations that we believe will help make St. Olaf a more welcoming and inclusive community for everyone. The recommendations are informed by the work of the Collective and the Task Force, opinions and ideas of our community, best practices from other institutions, and the charge set forth to us by President Anderson.

We hope that our recommendations, which have significant policy implications, offer a more comprehensive framework for positive and lasting changes for the St. Olaf community, supporting:

- A healthy campus environment in which individuals feel welcomed, respected, valued, and supported, and where they are fully able to achieve, flourish and contribute.
- A campus community that includes the fullest possible range of diverse perspectives and backgrounds essential to rigorous learning.
- A college that commits to growth in diversity and inclusion as central to the accomplishment of its mission.

We are heartened by the many activities that are happening on campus to support equity and inclusion efforts. However, through our many conversations over the past several months, we have learned that these activities have not been coordinated or institutionalized as a part of a comprehensive strategy. Our recommendations seek to remedy that problem and ensure that equity and inclusion efforts are integrated throughout campus.

This report is not intended to be the conclusive answer to end the issues of systemic and institutional racism at St. Olaf. The following recommendations are based on our best thinking at this time about the specific cultural context at St. Olaf. The work of equity and inclusion is ever-changing, and our recommendations suggest an approach that will allow St. Olaf to adapt and engage in new ideas, approaches and mechanisms for our community's work today and in the future.

Our recommendations, which were approved by all members of the Working Group, are organized into five broad categories: climate and community; sustainability; access and inclusion; scholarship and learning; and institutional commitment. Each category has specific, actionable strategies that we recommend the college implement. The recommendations are focused on providing greater accountability, intentionality, alignment and sustainability for work in equity and inclusion across the college. These recommendations do not stand alone; they are all pieces of an integrated approach.

Climate and community

As a part of its [mission](#), St. Olaf “strive[s] to be a place of welcome to all,” and seeks “to advance the ideal of a community where people of all backgrounds and identities belong.” As demonstrated by not only last year’s events, but for many years, many students from historically underrepresented groups have experienced a negative climate and felt marginalized on campus. Students face unconscious bias and, at times, harassment or discrimination, because of their race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, or religion, amongst other factors. These experiences are reflected in the Campus Living, Learning, and Working Environment survey administered in late 2017 (see Appendix E) and were chronicled by the Collective in its May 2017 report, [Racism and Change on the Hill, 1874-2017](#).

St. Olaf is not immune from the historical impact of racism and prejudice within the United States and abroad. St. Olaf must become more self-reflective and conscious of institutional racism that exists and is perpetuated by the college’s policies, practices and attitudes, though they may not mention any specific racial or marginalized group. To ignore this reality creates, maintains and fails to remedy accumulated advantages for historically privileged groups. Those who are part of the dominant culture at St. Olaf must recognize not just that those from historically underrepresented groups are more likely to not only feel isolated, invisible or unwelcome, but also that the historical setting of outdated and unaudited community policies may perpetuate actualized disadvantages. In addition, while voices of the underrepresented groups must be heard, members of these groups may feel burdened by the perceived expectation that they “represent” or “speak for” their respective populations.

Individuals from all backgrounds must be able to thrive at St. Olaf. The college therefore needs to develop and sustain a campus community and culture that creates healthy environments in which all individuals feel welcomed, included, valued and affirmed. There must not be a “we” and a “they,” but all members of our community should feel like they are a part of this place. Part of creating this community will include curricular and co-curricular opportunities and involve building capacity to engage difference and holding healthy discussions on race, racism, diversity, inclusion and equity. Then everyone will be able to fully achieve and contribute, and thereby realize St. Olaf’s mission of being a vibrant, beloved community that welcomes and affirms everyone’s worth.

- **Admissions:** For most students, the St. Olaf experience begins during their junior and senior year of high school when their first contact with the college occurs. First impressions are vitally important and how underrepresented students experience the admissions process shapes their expectations on their future life on campus. Whether the student is a fourth generation St. Olaf legacy recruit, a first generation low-income participant in a college access program, or a star quarterback on a rural high school football team, they should all enter the college through the same gates having experienced a consistent recruitment process that lessens the perceptions of “how” you were admitted and emphasizes the importance on “why” your admission is so important to the St. Olaf community.

We recommend that the college establish a strategic plan within the Office of Admissions that creates a framework for how the office will meet its goals for recruiting a consistently diverse cohort of students bringing more specificity to the racial, cultural, socioeconomic and demographic goals in each of the diverse categories.

To accomplish this, we recommend that the college attract and retain senior leadership in the division that has the skills, experience and expertise to support the plan and provide leadership, training and support to other members of the staff. This leader should be charged with ensuring that the ability to recruit and successfully matriculate a diverse cohort of new students becomes a core competency of all staff in the office.

- **Sense of belonging:** Students need to feel that they belong on campus from Week One, regardless of their racial, political, religious, or other identities. While we understand that students go through a variety of development sessions during Week One, orientation should highlight the benefits of diversity on our campus and train incoming students, faculty and staff on the college's values and policies. Everyone should continue to feel supported and welcomed as they go about their day-to-day life on campus. And once students leave the Hill, they should feel welcomed and engaged as alumni. In order to accomplish this lasting sense of belonging, St. Olaf should:
 - Provide consistent onboarding and orientation for all new faculty, staff and students to ensure awareness and understanding of diversity and inclusion policies, resources and goals, and their individual and collective accountabilities to advance the college's mission in the area of diversity and inclusion.
 - Assess, enhance, expand and develop pre-orientation and bridge programs designed to support the transition of underrepresented populations to the St. Olaf community. Examine whether populations who don't fall into existing program guidelines are adequately supported and those guidelines are possibly expanded.
 - Provide continued support for the development, nurturing and engagement of alumni affinity groups. Provide dedicated resources, personnel, and a structure to support networking, mentoring, programming, and engagement centered with the Alumni and Parent Relations department.
 - Build a culture of trust and continue to encourage students to fully utilize and enhance the process the college uses to thoroughly investigate, adjudicate and remedy bias incidents and hate crimes.
- **Mentorship:** St. Olaf should develop opportunities to engage a diverse group of alumni, faculty and staff to play a role in student programs and initiatives. Research shows that minority students perform better when people who share their identities are in teaching, mentoring and/or leadership positions. We recommend the college foster formal and informal mentoring opportunities for students, faculty and staff from historically underrepresented populations. The

creation of a mentor directory could be a valuable resource to help connect students to on- and off-campus mentorship opportunities and build valuable, supportive relationships among community members.

- **Residence life:** With 95% of students living on campus, St. Olaf's four-year residential requirement provides an opportunity to facilitate and expand educational environments and communities, including living-learning communities and special living options, that promote diversity and inclusion and integrative learning experiences.

Although we did not have the opportunity to fully explore this dimension of the college, we know that residence life represents a great opportunity for St. Olaf to enhance equity and inclusion efforts. In our research, we learned about one successful program at Earlham College that uses residence hall staff to help students foster better understanding of each other, enhance respect and trust, and make connections and friendships across difference – all with the aim of establishing an enriched, inclusive community where difference is respected and understood. St. Olaf could explore enhancing their residence-based training and education with a program like this. Students could explore topics like: what does it mean for students who are different to live together? What does it mean to be a friend, especially across difference? What does it mean to respect someone, even if they are different from you? While these questions may seem rudimentary, it is critical to intentionally help students build profound, lifelong friendships as we prepare them to live in a diverse world.

- **Center for Multicultural and International Engagement (CMIE):** St. Olaf should assess the structure and resource needs of CMIE. The hiring of a new vice president of student life provides an opportunity to explore transitioning CMIE to the Student Life Division. For all students to feel welcome, international students and students of color can be served under the same cultural umbrella (CMIE), but by staff with distinct skills and competencies that can support the unique needs of domestic and international students while building a stronger core engagement center for cross-cultural and global learning and interaction both at the inter- and intragroup level. CMIE should also support campus-wide collaborations and learning by creating a student-focused laboratory on living and learning across all the intersections of identity students bring to campus.

We recommend that CMIE be fully staffed by at least three full-time student life professionals who can individually meet the unique needs of domestic students of color, international students, and students who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered and/or otherwise identity fluid or questioning. These professionals should be supported with adequate administrative support and student work staff.

- **Vibrant community:** St. Olaf has an incredibly rich and vibrant community, which is celebrated in many ways. It is imperative that the college continues to support events that expose students to diverse viewpoints and celebrate diverse cultures and heritages. While we are heartened by the many on-campus events that highlight diverse cultures and activities, we are cognizant of the

challenges this may pose. With more than 200 student organizations plus academic departments and offices hosting programming, there is stiff competition for attendees and event fatigue. There is also no centralized entity that tracks programming to ensure equity and diversity.

We recommend that St. Olaf examine the events and programs it is supporting to ensure that they reflect the college's values and diverse community. The administration should be more intentional about actively creating and supporting campus-wide celebrations for events such as Martin Luther King, Jr. Day and Native American Heritage Month. The college should look for synergies among existing programs for greater impact around cultural events, make events more accessible, and encourage greater participation from faculty, staff and alumni.

Other recommendations to consider in enhancing St. Olaf's vibrant community include:

- Continue and augment programming that creates venues for regular dialogues that support intellectual and ideological diversity. Foster opportunities for intergroup dialogue and engagement with a focus on facilitating students' learning and development around social group identity, social inequality, political difference, and intergroup relations. As an academic institution and liberal arts college, we have a responsibility to bring members of our community together to exchange ideas and rigorously discuss diverse viewpoints. Especially in today's world, it is critical that we teach students to be able to talk across ideological divides.
- Continue to build hospitality and programming for students from a wide variety of religious backgrounds as well as interfaith activities. The religious landscape in the United States has been changing dramatically over the last several decades. St. Olaf is not only multicultural, but also has a vibrant, multi-religious community. College Ministry currently provides support to individual students and multiple student organizations of diverse religious identities, and we recommend surveying religious life on campus to examine what further resources may be needed.
- Conduct an audit of all displays, artwork and images that appear on campus to ensure that the identities and ideologies displayed in physical spaces represent a diverse and inclusive community. Review physical spaces and structures for greater inclusion and accessibility, including gender inclusive restrooms and prayer and meditation spaces. Consider the renaming of conference rooms, commons areas or other signature physical spaces to recognize the pioneers of underrepresented groups as a part of the historic St. Olaf community.

Sustainability

Culture change requires dedicated, and ongoing attention and work over considerable time in order to be successful. Higher education should confront big issues head-on, and diversity, equity and inclusion are no different. To change St. Olaf's culture, diversity, equity and inclusion efforts need to be deeply embedded into the college's institutional structure and long-term strategic plans. As referenced extensively in Appendix C, St. Olaf has implemented or is in the process of implementing initiatives to improve diversity, equity and inclusion on campus. These efforts have enriched campus life but have had a limited effect due to their compartmentalized nature. These curricular and co-curricular opportunities should be mutually reinforcing and should spark discussions and welcoming interactions throughout our campus.

St. Olaf currently has no mechanism to oversee and advise on campus-wide inclusion and equity efforts. New governance structures are critical to developing strategic plans that coordinate efforts across the campus, analyze metrics, and ensure the accountability of the administration.

- **Permanent St. Olaf Council on Equity and Inclusion:** St. Olaf should put in place a new governance structure to oversee equity and inclusion efforts across the campus and sustain the work surrounding these initiatives. The St. Olaf Council on Equity and Inclusion would assist in the development and monitoring of the college's strategic equity and inclusion plans and metrics, advise the administration on the implementation of the recommendations contained in this report, connect disparate efforts across campus, and serve as a resource for academic and administrative departments. There is need for continued healing from present and historical hurt in our community, and the Council would create a deliberate and intentional space for healing and trust building.

We recommend that the Council launch a thorough examination of institutional racism and structural barriers, as well as cultural norms and values, that exist in the college that prevent our students from having the excellent, equitable education espoused in the college's mission. For example, athletics needs to be examined for racial disparities in recruiting. Mental health counseling needs to be examined for barriers to access. Music organizations need to examine the diversity of their recruitment. Disciplinary practices in student life need to be examined to make sure they are equitable. This is not an exhaustive list, and we recommend that all of the departments in the college be part of this examination. We highly recommend that the Council engage expertise in and outside the college.

Additionally, the Council should work closely with the administration and the Board of Regents to create a strategic equity and inclusion plan (see the recommendation below) and incorporate it throughout the college's long-term strategic plan. The Council should work closely with *To Include is To Excel* and other existing programs to align diversity, equity and inclusion efforts across the campus. Finally, the Council should make an annual report to the President and Board of Regents.

It is critical that the Council be widely representative of campus voices and be constituted from all areas of campus life. We recommend that the President and Board of Regents chair select the chair of the Council with input from the President's Leadership Team. The chair would then help recruit members and put in place the governance structure for any future elections.

The Council should be formed with input from the community and could represent the leadership and voices of the following constituencies:

- President's Leadership Team
- Athletics
- Music
- Race and Ethnic Studies department
- Students
- Faculty
- Staff
- Alumni

It is vital that committee members who are chosen for this work are committed to eliminate racism and enhance social justice at St. Olaf and appreciate the urgency of this work. We strongly recommend that the Council include community members who are passionate about this aspect of college life, as well as those with relevant scholarly expertise, such as faculty in the Race and Ethnic Studies department. We invite a process of forming the Council that is transparent and inclusive, such as holding elections through the Student Government Association, Faculty Nominating Committee, and Alumni Board.

We recommend that all Council members undergo rigorous implicit bias training and development at the beginning of their tenure despite their particular level of experience in equity and inclusion work, so in order that everyone comes to the table with at least the same baseline of knowledge.

To be an effective force for change, the Council will need administrative assistance and financial resources. In addition to ongoing funding from the college, St. Olaf should develop a proactive strategy to pursue grant money through the Government, Foundation, and Corporate Relations Department for the Council's work and outside consultants.

We recommend that the Council be formed in a transparent, collaborative fashion in summer 2018 with student members joining in the fall. The Council should provide regular updates to the college community on diversity and inclusion efforts online and by email.

- **Strategic equity and inclusion plan:** The first task of the Council should be to develop a multi-year strategic diversity and inclusion plan. The plan should include a vision statement that acknowledges the value of diversity and an institutional commitment to creating and sustaining a diverse and inclusive community.

This plan should incorporate short- and long-term strategies to make St. Olaf a welcoming and inclusive place for all and to ensure that people of all identities are valued and respected. The plan should address all areas of campus life for students, faculty and staff, including residence life, academics, athletics, and workplaces. The plan should also assess the institutional structure of the college to ensure that the college is organized in a way that supports equity and inclusion efforts. This plan should not be solely a series of new initiatives but instead integrated into the college's strategic plan, which the Board of Regents can amend at any time.

The Council should formulate the plan in consultation with the Board of Regents, administration, academic leadership, staff, and others across campus. The Council should consider holding community open houses or focus groups to gain insight from students, faculty, staff, alumni and others across the college. The plan should include specific goals and responsibilities for each individual area of the college. In addition, the plan should coordinate across all sectors and individual areas of the college for the purpose of establishing larger shared goals and strategies for the college as a whole.

- **Accountability:** To ensure senior administrators meet their commitments to advancing diversity and inclusion, the Board of Regents should institute oversight mechanisms within its existing committee structure. Because it can take time to pilot and evaluate new efforts, success should be measured by the progress made on the overall effort.

The Council should formally report twice a year to the Board of Regents' Executive Committee. The report should include information on its activities and progress, as well as any barriers that are impeding its work.

- **Research and reporting:** Measuring the progress of this effort will require consistent and comprehensive data collection, analysis and use. We recommend that the Council work with Institutional Research and Information Technologies to develop metrics, benchmarks, and data processes that will help gauge the success of the college's efforts. At a minimum, we recommend St. Olaf collect data on student, staff and faculty demographics, applicants and retention rates; development efforts; and perceptions of the campus climate for student life, academics, and the workplace. The college should also conduct regular climate studies, surveys, audits, and focus groups that are culturally appropriate and responsive. Results should be shared with the campus communities. The Council should analyze and use the assessments when advising the administration and Board of Regents on creating, modifying or enhancing programs, policies, procedures, practices, and initiatives supporting all elements of diversity and inclusion.

In our research, we were impressed with the transparency and utility of Cornell University's [Diversity Dashboards](#) which measure progress of its diversity initiatives around four core principles: composition, engagement, inclusion and achievement. We recommend that the college invest in the technology necessary for such data collection. This small investment of \$7,000-

\$10,000 annually for data visualization software is critical to being able to monitor and analyze St. Olaf's progress and adjust the college's efforts as necessary.

- **Outside expertise:** The Council and administration should seek outside expertise as warranted to provide fresh perspectives on institutional racism, diversity, inclusion, and equity issues at the college.

Access and inclusion

A critical component of creating a welcoming community for all is to develop a campus community that includes the fullest possible range of diverse perspectives and backgrounds. This is essential to creating a rigorous learning environment and a holistic residential life experience for all students. In recent years, St. Olaf has increased the diversity of its student body to 25%, while falling short in areas of faculty and staff diversity, which are only 14.5% non-white or international. In order to support an increasingly diverse student body, as well as to achieve its mission, the college must aggressively seek, obtain and promote an equally diverse group of faculty, staff and leadership at every level. St. Olaf must examine its existing policies and practices and commit itself to creating and implementing policies that will allow a diverse community to flourish. Additionally, the college must create a culture where students, faculty and staff feel comfortable bringing concerns of bias to the college's attention.

- **Student recruitment and retention:** St. Olaf should continue to increase recruitment, enrollment, and retention of students coming from backgrounds historically underrepresented at the college. These efforts should be aimed at not only students coming from diverse racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds, but also include, but not be limited to, first-generation, economically disadvantaged, LGBTQ, disabled, immigrant, and international students. The College should examine current recruitment practices of the Admissions Office and its staffing and structure, and explore ways to broaden the admissions pool of diverse students, especially among domestic students of color.

St. Olaf must be innovative and allocate resources for new programs and methods that will ensure the retention of a diverse student body. Academic advisors and other faculty and staff who serve as formal or informal mentors should receive continuing education in new and existing resources the college offers these students, such as how to navigate financial aid. The college should breakdown informational silos in order to promote increased access to and effectiveness of these resources.

St. Olaf's financial aid awards reflect a genuine commitment to access and equity by developing means to support the needs of historically underrepresented and first-generation students. However, we have heard from students that there are places where the college's policies, procedures, or practices create barriers for students with demonstrated financial need. For example, students were required to submit a down payment on their tuition before registering for classes, when financial aid packages had not been deposited and some students did not have the cash flow to provide a down payment. We understand this issue has been resolved, but we want to ensure that there are no similar unintentional barriers that prevent students from fully participating in college life.

We also recommend that St. Olaf assess the resources and services provided to the college's diverse student population, and make any reallocations or reorganization necessary to ensure students' needs and development in all areas of student life are met. Questions to ask include:

Does the college's wellness model support students of color, LGBTQ students, and international students? Are the unique issues related to career development among first-generation college students considered? Are campus spaces and facilities welcoming and accessible to all people and cultures? Do the spaces and facilities provide visibility, safety, support, and resources for diversity and inclusion?

Finally, St. Olaf's high-impact learning opportunities contribute to the college's excellence and are an important part of student experiences at the college. They must be available to everyone, however, regardless of their racial, ethnic or economic background. As an example of disparity, students of color currently only make up 10-15% of the number of students who study abroad overall. We understand that St. Olaf offers resources to students who are not able to afford these opportunities, but these resources should be better marketed to ensure all students have equal access and opportunity to participate in varsity athletics, music groups and ensembles, study abroad, and other high-impact programs.

- **Faculty and staff recruitment and retention:** St. Olaf should continue to follow and expand the efforts of the Office of the Provost to increase recruitment, hiring and retention of tenure-track faculty from historically underrepresented groups. The college should make similar efforts for hiring staff and administration leaders and require that candidate pools be reflective of the diversity of the profession.

St. Olaf must carefully scrutinize its policy and current practices for faculty recruitment, retention and promotion for the purposes of creating diverse candidate pools that attract exceptional talent across all disciplines and retaining those who are hired. Expectations for cultural competence should be included in job descriptions, and faculty and staff performance evaluations should include consideration of the individual's commitment to diversity.

The college should consider funding innovation grants for faculty undertaking work concerned with diversity and inclusion and/or developing new courses that explore matters related to equity and inclusion. The Council could administer the innovation grants, which could be given to scholars from any academic discipline. A good example of this is Cornell College's [Towards New Destinations grants](#). The college should also consider creating an endowed chair position for a professor whose scholarship and expertise is centered on diversity and inclusion. This endowed chair position could rotate between academic departments and could be an incentive tool for hiring a senior professor.

We recommend that St. Olaf dedicate significant resources for the attraction, support, retention, and advancement of faculty and staff from historically underrepresented groups. This might include the creation of an office or program dedicated to these goals.

St. Olaf should provide department and program leadership with development to support and retain faculty and staff of color. The unique needs and challenges of these employees in the classroom, college and community must be understood. Appropriate resources needed by such faculty and staff to flourish must be made available.

- **Alumni and parent engagement:** We commend and support the work of the Piper Center and Alumni and Parent Relations to develop and build relationships with identity-based affinity groups. We recommend this work continue and be expanded to include other departments and programs that can benefit from a wider avenue of input and engagement.

Scholarship and learning

Our college community, like our national community, has grown in diversity. However, St. Olaf has not comprehensively reviewed or revised its curriculum and pedagogy in response. Though much good work is ongoing in this respect, a broader and deeper approach – separate from specific initiatives – has not been fully implemented across the college.

Learning that involves exposure to diverse views and perspectives must be a core aim of a liberal arts education and is more closely connected to the values we espouse in our mission. Such learning also responds to both the experiences of our changing community and to the inherent virtue of an education that delivers content reflective of multiple viewpoints without prioritizing a dominant cultural perspective.

St. Olaf's aspiration to be a more equitable and inclusive college cannot be realized without the inclusion of diverse perspectives in all academic departments. General education requirements, courses, and majors must expose students to diversity in all aspects, to prepare them for fulfilling lives of leadership and achievement in a pluralistic democracy.

- **Curriculum:** The college has begun to review curriculum through *To Include is To Excel* and the General Education Task Force, which are commendable steps forward. Curriculum should prepare students to understand the dynamics of power and identity they encounter in the world and acknowledge and respect the backgrounds and identities of all students. All academic departments should be a part of this review process and should examine course offerings on an ongoing basis through the lens of diversity and inclusion. This work is best initiated at the departmental/program level, but the current review of general education requirements is a timely opportunity to enhance college-wide conversations on this subject. The college should provide the resources required for departments and programs to conduct this work. Academic departments should communicate the results of their review and future plans to the provost. A regular review of curriculum through the lens of equity and inclusion should be a part of the college's strategic plan.
- **General education requirements:** Required first-year courses offer excellent opportunities for all students to read and discuss materials dealing with the themes of diversity, equity and inclusion. The intended learning outcomes of these courses should be revised to incorporate this subject matter. Other required courses (e.g., multicultural-domestic and multicultural-global) offer excellent opportunities for teaching and learning about diversity. The flexibility of these courses to treat relevant matters of contemporary and continuing concern (e.g., race, ethnicity, religion, gender, and ideology) must be utilized. We commend all the ways in which various courses already incorporate diversity in materials and pedagogy.
- **Classroom environment:** St. Olaf classrooms are increasingly filled with students who come from diverse nations, cultures and backgrounds. Teaching in this environment requires different skills

and sensitivities. Faculty must be culturally competent, and need to be equipped to make the diverse classroom a hospitable and welcoming educational space for all students. The college should accelerate providing hands-on development to faculty and staff to ensure that classrooms are safe spaces for students to learn and engage in diverse perspectives.

- **Student retention and graduation rates:** While St. Olaf has increased the diversity of its student body, the college is struggling with retaining and graduating diverse students. For example, African American students only had a six-year graduation rate of 66.7%, while white students had a six-year graduation rate of 89%. (The full statistics from the past six years are available on [St. Olaf's website](#).) We recognize the problem that limited numbers presents in statistical analysis. Nevertheless, we recommend that St. Olaf explore ways to make the graduation rate more even among racial groups.

Institutional commitment

The St. Olaf President and senior administrators' commitment to equity and inclusion must be paramount to the college's efforts to change its culture and make St. Olaf a more welcoming place for all. Core institutional documents – like mission statements and strategic plans – inform institutional priorities and the allocation of funds and resources. Additionally, the structures of the institution can be opportunities to enhance equity and inclusion, provided the college's policies, practices, communications, and decision-making are in alignment with St. Olaf's goals for diversity and inclusion. Perhaps most critically, the campus community needs to be fully aware of and trust the college's institutional commitment to advancing the work of equity and inclusion.

While the Working Group recommends creating a Council that will examine the structural barriers preventing all community members from equal access and inclusion, we also acknowledge there are relational barriers that prevent everyone at St. Olaf from experiencing a sense of welcome and belonging. In many ways the college continues to operate like a small familial organization where everyone knows everyone and problems are still solved by handshakes and mutual agreement. In fact, the college has continued to grow and become more diverse with an increase in domestic students of color and international students, more students experiencing mental health concerns, a more visible LGBTQ community, a significant increase in the number of new faculty who have taught at the college for less than 10 years, and a growing up-tick in the number of faculty coming from historically underrepresented backgrounds. While the college continues to operate like a small intimate institution, the needs of the community and scope of the operation have grown and assumptions about “who we are and how we work together” are continuously changing. Addressing and overcoming relational barriers also requires an institutional commitment to equity and inclusion.

The language in these recommendations – *engagement, listening, welcome* – is relational; it is about how members of the St. Olaf community encounter and engage each other. How do people at St. Olaf live with one another, work with each other, and listen to each other, particularly across differences? How does the college intentionally cultivate the cultural responsiveness, empathy and curiosity that St. Olaf would like Oles to have for one another and the world? Such cultivation requires not just structural changes but a transformation of how everyone at the college forms and deepens interpersonal relationships.

The Working Group recognizes it is not enough for a diverse group of people to be put into a space. Rather, each must understand that they are part of a hospitable community, and all must understand that everyone belongs to this community. St. Olaf must be a safe place where all can engage in deep, healthy discourse so that their views are heard, engaged and challenged. Hateful ideologies are not welcome, but all people must be respected. All members of the St. Olaf community share a commitment to each other's well-being. Diversity is not just a fact of demography; it is about relationships and about respectful engagement with all people. One of the ways St. Olaf can move toward equity and inclusion is in creating the conditions that promote the formation of deep human relationships across barriers or boundaries of difference, where each person's culture and experience is valued. Though people are drawn to coalesce

around shared identity, St. Olaf must create a community in which the diversity of identities present on campus are not exiled to separate spaces.

- **Sustained engagement:** We recommend that all units of the college, together and collaboratively, have opportunities for sustained engagement on learning about racism and individuals' roles in helping the college become more equitable and inclusive. The Sustained Dialogue model (small group, interactive, and collaborative) has been an effective model for this type of engagement, and additional models should be considered. Consideration should be given to a dedicated time each year when the entire community has the opportunity in mixed groups, with the aid of a facilitator, to learn, discuss and assess ourselves around these themes. This is also an opportunity for relationship-building across our differences. Ideally, such a meeting should occur at the beginning of the school year.
- **Listening sessions:** Because diversity, equity and inclusion are relational issues, the college needs to be more intentionally relational at all levels. The president and other senior administrators should regularly hold informal conversations throughout the academic year with groups they may not hear from on a regular basis. These conversations should be deep human encounters of openness, humility, and active listening, guided by mutual respect. Such conversations are necessary for building trust and creating mutual understanding.
- **Points of welcome:** We recommend the college identify and augment established "points of welcome" (both formal and informal) on campus. (Points of welcome include Admissions, Financial Aid, Student Housing and Student Life for students, and Human Resources and individual departments for faculty and staff.) Points of welcome must cultivate an ongoing, internal understanding and appreciation of the unique challenges all new members of our community face as they transition to life at our institution and our community, and the specific ways those challenges are enhanced for members of marginalized groups. They must then offer intentional, concrete support to new community members.

If we want to enhance the diversity of our faculty and staff, we need to have the structures in place to support them. We cannot assume that students, faculty and staff can join our community without assistance. Our community is core to who we are, and as the demographics of our community shift, the resources that we provide them as they enter our community also need to shift.

Over time, these "points of welcome" may provide insight into other supportive infrastructure the College may need to consider, such as low-cost, temporary housing for faculty and staff relocating from out of state. Accessing housing has been a challenge for our faculty and staff, and the college should be concerned about the housing market in Northfield. We recommend that St. Olaf have a representative on the City of Northfield Human Rights Commission who can articulate the needs of our population who are living or want to be living in the community.

- **Faculty and staff development:** St. Olaf should provide ongoing professional development and training opportunities for all faculty and staff that are inclusive and culturally relevant in design. The college should move away from online modules and develop capacity to deliver effective training and education using the expertise, gifts, skills, and talents of campus members and outside experts. Development opportunities should be specific to the needs of each department. Additionally, the college should provide ongoing development for senior leadership, department chairs, and supervisory personnel to ensure they have the skills to meet the specific needs of faculty and staff of color. Academic advisors and counselors should also have specific development on needs of historically underrepresented communities, including specific training on the impacts of historical trauma.

While Human Resources should be the primary administrative unit for professional development for all faculty and staff, the Council should approve the content of such training. If online diversity training is necessary, it should also include in-person group facilitation that allows interpersonal engagement and skill development.

- **Student development and capacity building:** Student leaders should receive cultural sensitivity training that enables them to build diverse, equitable and inclusive campus organizations. The college should develop intentional strategies to recruit across all students for leadership positions (e.g., tour guides, student organizations, Student Government Association, residence life, tutors, peer advisors, etc.).

While one of the college's goals is to dismantle racism and other forms of injustice, St. Olaf should also develop programs that provide opportunities for marginalized students to build capacity for healing and resilience. Structures of support for coping with and responding to racism, bigotry, and other forms of discrimination are needed during college and beyond. The improved bias incident reporting is a welcome step for responding; however, more formalized ongoing support is also needed.

CONCLUSION

Over the past seven months, we heard a clear call to action from alumni, students, parents, faculty and staff that St. Olaf needs to do more to root out racism, make the campus a welcoming, nurturing community for all its members, and ensure all have equitable access to a St. Olaf education. We sought to be balanced in our approach to the issues and to view them from multiple perspectives. We are grateful for and humbled by the time and energy our community has devoted to helping St. Olaf evolve and mature, and to honor the commitments and values it espouses. We will be a better community for our work together, and these efforts will make a better college for those who join us in the future

An inclusive and racially equitable campus is inherently more stimulating and enriching than a homogenous and exclusive one. The more that everyone can have experiences with difference, the more likely they are to reconsider long-held convictions, to engage in lively debate, and to break new ground in thinking and action. A diverse and truly welcoming campus will constantly challenge all members of our community to have an open mind and compassionate heart. And it will enable St. Olaf to meet its mission of being “an inclusive, globally engaged community” and to use higher education as an instrument to change the lives of our students for the common good.

APPENDIX A: WORKING GROUP MEMBERS

The 11-member Working Group included students, faculty, alumni, members of the Board of Regents, and diversity and inclusion experts. These members brought unique skills, knowledge and experience that helped move this work forward.

- **Glenn Taylor '73** is a St. Olaf Regent and co-chair of the Working Group. He is a retired health care executive who lives in Libertyville, Illinois.
- **Phil Milne '81** is a St. Olaf Regent and co-chair of the Working Group. He is the owner of the Rapid Packaging company and lives in Wayzata, Minnesota.
- **Mary Barbosa-Jerez** serves as the head of strategy for library collections and archives at St. Olaf.
- **Eddie Bryson '20** is a studio art major from Memphis, Tennessee, and a member of the St. Olaf football team.
- **Katherine Fick** is the associate college pastor at St. Olaf and plays a central role in nurturing the college's values and supporting the health and well-being of the community.
- **Bruce King** is the assistant to the president for institutional diversity and chief diversity officer at St. Olaf.
- **Donna Lee** is Macalester College's vice president for student affairs. She has presented numerous workshops on topics related to diversity, leadership, organizational development, and community engagement.
- **David Merchant '77** is an attorney who has lived and worked in Laos, Thailand, Washington, D.C., and Minnesota. He has dedicated much of his life to working on civil rights, racial equality, and justice for all.
- **Mario Paez '01** is a vice president at USI and lives in St. Paul. He is a member of the St. Olaf Alumni Board.
- **Anantanand Rambachan** is a professor of religion at St. Olaf and a renowned Hindu scholar who has been involved in the field of interreligious relations and dialogue for more than 25 years.
- **Mariem Zaghdoudi '20** is a political science and biology major who was elected to serve as the Board of Regents Student Committee Coordinator. She is an international student from Tunisia.

APPENDIX B: TIMELINE

Last spring, protests on campus triggered by a series of racist epithets and messages targeted at students throughout the year made us pause and reflect on how the college can better make students of different cultures, races, social identities, socio-economic backgrounds, and beliefs feel not only welcome, but included.

Sequence of events

- **October 2016-April 2017:** Nine incidents of racist epithets and messages
- **April 24, 2017:** Students protested with signs on the doors of and inside Buntrock Commons
- **April 27, 2017:** Faculty/Student Teach-In, Faculty/Staff Inclusion Event
- **April 29, 2017:** Students staged a [sit-in](#) in Buntrock Commons
- **May 1, 2017:** Students staged a sit-in in Tomson Hall. They provided terms of engagement and a list of demands. After negotiations, President Anderson and his leadership team agreed on the [terms of engagement](#) and the appointment of an autonomous task force.
- **May 4, 2017:** The board unanimously approved a resolution demonstrating its support for the initiatives and measures taken by college leadership to confront these issues. Members also met with the Collective for Change on the Hill and presented the [resolution](#).
- **May 10, 2017:** President Anderson [updated the campus community](#) about the investigation, reporting that the perpetrator of the ninth racist incident that occurred on April 29 confessed and that although that incident was a hoax, the college was still pursuing its investigation into the other earlier racist incidents on campus.
- **May 19, 2017:** President Anderson and his leadership team [publicly shared their response to the demands](#) presented by the Collective for Change on the Hill.
- **May 22, 2017:** President Anderson announced the [Task Force on Institutional Racism](#) members.
- **June-August 2017:** The Task Force held regular meetings.
- **August 30, 2017:** President Anderson provided an update on steps the college is taking toward the goal of creating and sustaining a welcoming, inclusive, bias-free environment including training for faculty, staff, and students; an updated procedure for bias incident reporting; and the launch of the [To Include is To Excel](#) project.
- **September 3, 2017:** The Task Force released its [report](#).
- **September 6, 2017:** The President's Leadership Team issued a response to the Task Force report and committed to establishing a working group.
- **September 25, 2017:** President Anderson announced the appointment of the [Working Group on Equity and Inclusion](#).
- **December 6, 2017:** President Anderson received a \$250,000 "Senior President's Discretionary Grant" from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to support the process of the Working Group and provide seed money for some of its recommendations.

- **September 2017-May 2018:** Working Group conducts a review of equity and inclusion efforts at St. Olaf and formulates recommendations to create a more inclusive campus environment.
- **May 1, 2018:** Working Group submits its report to the St. Olaf president and community.

APPENDIX C: ST. OLAF DIVERSITY INITIATIVES

Since its founding in 1874, St. Olaf has promoted scholarship and learning opportunities for diverse communities, first as one of the few original coeducational schools in the country, and more recently as a college that strives to increase the diversity of its student body, faculty and staff as a foundational value.

To accomplish these goals, St. Olaf has facilitated several scholarships, programs and partnerships to create a campus that welcomes difference, invites dialogue, and builds community, including:

- Scholarships available for first generation students, like the **Johnson Family Opportunity Fund**
- **Posse Foundation** scholarship program for diverse student leaders
- **TRIO programs**, which help students overcome class, social and cultural barriers to higher education
- **TRIO McNair Scholars Program**, a graduate school preparatory program connecting low-income, first generation, and underrepresented students to internship and research opportunities
- **Davis UWC Scholar Program** for international students.
- **Sustained Dialogue** program, which works to create community change by building powerful relationships across differences
- **To Include is To Excel** initiative that aims to examine and improve course offerings and modes of teaching for an increasingly diverse student body.

Inclusion and equity work is ongoing at St. Olaf. As recently as April 2018, St. Olaf administrators are considering and/or implementing several efforts to improve equity and inclusion, including:

- Modifying the faculty search process to require candidates to offer a diversity statement
- Changing qualifications for entry-level positions to attract a more diverse pool of applicants
- Eliminating bias in library resource descriptions
- Offering opportunities for Diversity and Inclusion training and professional development on campus
- Instituting a Diversity and Inclusion Committee in the Enrollment Division of the Admissions Department
- Holding listening sessions for diverse faculty to have input in the General Education revisions
- Integrating restorative justice techniques into the Bias Response Protocol System
- Providing diverse faculty additional professional development resources through the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity (NCFDD)
- Developing a college-wide Preferred Names Policy (currently awaiting approval)
- Participating in the Council of Independent Colleges' Diversity, Civility and the Liberal Arts project

- Training public safety officers on implicit bias; hate crime and bias incident investigations; and trauma-informed interviewing
- Encouraging students to think about inclusion when planning events and to collaborate with organizations to reach a wide range of students
- Requiring student organizations to have St. Olaf's non-discrimination clause included in their constitution
- Conducting assessments after events to determine how to reach more underrepresented students as future events are planned
- Establishing Let's Talk initiative at the Counseling Center to reach out and engage with more students
- Adding an Inclusivity Advocate position to Residence Hall Councils, a position dedicated to ensuring events and initiatives are accessible and inclusive, and facilitating dialogue at meetings regarding social identities
- Established the Inclusive Conversations Program, which supports student-proposed and -led projects aimed at increasing campus and community conversations related to inclusivity and diversity.
- Hosting alumni and student of color events across the country.
- Forging new recruiting partnerships with INROADS and BrandLab to cultivate pipelines and opportunities for underrepresented populations on campus.
- Piloting a first-year course that bridges the cultural backgrounds from which students come and the cultures of higher education and St. Olaf college. The course focuses on a broad range of issues critical to first year students achieving success, including discussions around identity, equity and inclusion.
- Training faculty on how "invisible" disabilities, including Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), learning disabilities, and other mental health diagnoses, impact people in college and how they can teach self-advocacy and support people with these diagnoses.
- Adjusting work study payroll from a monthly schedule to a biweekly schedule to allow more financial flexibility for student workers.
- Sponsoring a Workshop on Access and Equity to Theological Inquiry for faculty.
- Holding five learning circle events for faculty related to the structures of oppression and privilege and the development of cultural identity; white privilege and racial oppression; and basic skills to facilitate having difficult conversations around issues like oppression and privilege both in and out of the classroom.

APPENDIX D: SOCIAL JUSTICE IN HIGHER EDUCATION – FROM AWARENESS TO ACTION

The following essay was reprinted with permission by Rev. Dr. Jamie Washington.

Diversity, Multiculturalism, Social Justice. As higher education manages the changing demographics of students, faculty, and staff, these terms have been used synonymously to describe initiatives to create more inclusive and welcoming campus communities. Yet. Each of these terms means different things to different people.

Mention diversity and the first thing that comes to mind for many individuals is race. Even in areas of the country with large numbers of Latinos, Asian Americans, and Native Americans, the race paradigm is often perceived in terms of “Black and White.” When diversity is engaged, is it primarily a race issue with the possibility for other issues to be considered, or is the discussion intended to include all areas of difference? If higher education is committed to creating welcoming and inclusive campus communities for all, that means everyone across all races and cultures. Still, it is important to state clear community and cultural standards and reinforce those standards when individuals join communities. Diversity often takes a “we are the world” perspective. The underlying assumption is that a level playing field exists, and that all people have the same opportunities to achieve the American dream. This perspective sees people as individuals, rather than as members of groups with defined social identities.

Multiculturalism often takes difference in culture in account. While still a race and ethnicity conversation, multiculturalism acknowledges different norms, values, rules, and behaviors that are important to understand when engaging individuals across cultures. This concept also assumes a level playing field, but often lacks critical analyses of the prevailing cultural norms, values, or ways of being. Additionally, this encourages learning about the different “other” with very little attention to learning about one’s self.

If institutions are to move beyond the diversity numbers game, the dynamics of difference must be addressed. Social justice requires an examination of self as well as others. It also requires a look at group patterns and systematic processes that are incongruent with the values of “liberty and justice for all.” In *Teaching for Social Justice* (2007), Maurianne Adams and Lee Anne Bell state, “We believe social justice is both a process and a goal.” The goal of social justice is to create equal access and participation for all groups in society. This concept engages all differences, while recognizing the elements of power and privilege. Social justice does not give one form of oppression priority over another. It acknowledges the various forms of oppression, their similarities and differences, and how they manifest. It involves moving beyond comfort zones and making decisions to change the status quo.

Creating Social Justice

Colleges and universities are prime environments for students, faculty, and staff to develop the skills necessary to create a world more congruent with the values of liberty and justice for all. Rather than

simply diagnosing and analyzing the current problems of injustice, senior student affairs officers can prepare students to actually address the world's injustices. To achieve both the process and the goal of social justice, individuals and institutions must move through four stages: awareness, knowledge, skills, and actions. This process—familiar to those engaged in outcomes assessments, organizational change, or cultural change—requires intentional and deliberate action. It also requires an understanding of dominant and subordinated group memberships and the behaviors, attitudes, and feelings that accompany any given social identity.

Awareness: a greater consciousness of who you are and all of your social identities. Examine how your current behaviors, attitudes, feelings, and ideas align with core values. What parts of your identities place you as a member of the dominant group, affording you opportunities and privileges taken for granted? What parts of your identities make you a member of the subordinated group, leaving you feeling less than adequate and striving to fit in? How do you participate on a daily basis in keeping the status quo alive and well? What do you do on a daily basis to shift your world and the world of others to be more congruent with the values of social justice?

Knowledge: what you know and what you do not know about yourself and others. What are the missing pieces of your education? What do you know of the contributions of historically underrepresented groups? What do you know of the current struggles of these groups? What would equal access and an equitable society look like to people who are members of the subordinated group? What does privilege look like for the dominant group? What does internalized oppression look like? How do the dynamics of oppression manifest at the individual, group, and system/societal levels? Answers to these questions provide the knowledge to move toward a more socially just world.

Skills: engaging effectively across difference about difference. Many of us participate in “work or school” diversity. We go to work or school with people who are different by race, gender, class, religion, sexual

A Socially Just Environment

Within higher education, a socially just environment is one in which:

- All students learn and contribute to the best of their abilities.
- All faculty, staff, and administrators teach, learn, and serve to the best of their abilities.
- Curriculum, culture, and practices are both windows and mirrors, allowing community members to see themselves and to view the rest of the world.
- Leaders teach and model the skills and personal awareness competencies to succeed in a pluralistic society.

Key Values of a Socially Just Campus

- Engagement, exploration, and examination of the dynamics of difference
- Inclusion
- Empowerment
- Visibility
- Equity
- Access
- Social justice
- Shared responsibility, accountability, and leadership

orientation, ability, or nationality. Yet we grew up in and return home to monocultural experiences, leaving us unprepared to engage effectively across cultures because we lack practice. The skills needed to engage difference effectively include listening, asking, slowing down, paying attention to process, and recognizing complex human dynamics that occur at the intersections of difference.

Action: take steps to shift the status quo. A socially just world cannot be created without this step. Good people maintain the status quo by believing all they need to do is to behave as good people. Good people can consciously and unconsciously do harm if they are not clear about actions needed for change.

Building Diverse Community Foundations

What does all of this mean in the context of higher education and particularly student affairs? Many student affairs preparation programs offer opportunities through course work and assistantships to develop the knowledge and skills for competence in the social justice area. The challenge is that when individuals leave that environment, unless they continue to challenge themselves, they will slip back into unconscious behaviors that do not serve the goals of social justice. Certain elements form the foundation of any socially just campus community. Consider how your campus would benefit from adhering to the following tenets of diverse community foundations.

Build relationships of commitment and trust.

In every long-term relationship, there are many moments when you are ready to quit. As with any type of relationship, when it comes to building communities across difference, you must be willing to stay when it does not feel comfortable. Do not give up on each other because the “ism” clouds judgment and hearing. Be willing to move through the tough conversations and build deeper levels of trust and honesty that make for more authentic relationships.

Admit you do not know all there is to know.

One of our biggest challenges is helping people understand that it is acceptable to admit that we do not know everything about diversity. We live in a climate of “political correctness” in which we are afraid to express honesty about what we feel or think. Just because we have a Black or Latino friend, have been to a religious experience different than our own, or have viewed “Brokeback Mountain” several times, we do not fully understand diversity. Without this acknowledgement, we cannot learn. To build community, we must be honest with ourselves.

Do the best that you can.

Most people get up in the morning and try to do their best throughout the day. Even so, we can always do better. Few people intentionally express, “I’ll demonstrate racism or sexism today.” To motivate others to do better, we must meet them with energy that reflects we truly believe they are doing the best they can.

Acknowledge that inclusion in a group does not mean you understand the group.

One of the most common questions posed to under-represented individuals about a particular situation is, “What do your people think, want, or feel?” The assumption is that because you are a member of a certain group, you can speak for the entire group. You may be able to share a personal perspective as a member of

a group, but it does not mean you know everything about that population or the experiences of all members of that community.

Recognize you can understand even if you are not a member of the group.

While you may not share particular identities or struggles, it does not mean you cannot empathize or have the genuine desire to be an ally.

Understand oppression is pervasive and impacts everyone.

“Does everyone agree that some groups get treated with dignity and respect, get heard, get valued, and get access to resources, and other groups do not?” In posing that question in presentations, the answer is yes 100 percent of the time from 100 percent of the audience. Given the response to this simple question, it is clear that we all know the pervasiveness of oppression. The challenge is to take ownership of the places where we gain privilege and the places where we have internalized oppression as we make conscious decisions to create change.

Accept responsibility.

No one individual created oppression. It is not our fault that we were born into, adopted into, or even chose, in some cases, the groups that are more privileged in this society. However, we must accept responsibility for who we are, where we are, and what we do everyday to maintain the status quo and for what we can do to move toward liberty and justice for all.

Seek first to understand, then to be understood.

This foundation comes from Stephen Covey’s *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People* (Free Press, 1989). It is also very important in the context of diversity. Often we are engaged in conversation where we are so busy trying to be heard, that we are not hearing or listening. If we are to build communities across difference someone must be willing to slow down the process, seek to understand, and be understood. In this process, we often find common ground.

Make conflict and discomfort a part of growth.

Most individuals seek engaged, supportive, diverse communities, but want to remain in their comfort zones. There is no way to build community across difference without engaging in conflict and discomfort. When people successfully move through conflict and discomfort, relationships are strengthened and community develops.

Self-work and healing are necessary to accept others.

Much of the negative energy that is expressed about difference is from people living in pain. The pain may have been caused by a particular group or person during childhood, but individuals have never been able to move beyond the pain. These are real and valid feelings. However, unless you heal old wounds, it is hard to move forward in building community across difference.

Practice forgiveness and letting go.

Forgiveness begins with one’s self. If you are not able to forgive yourself, it is not likely that you can forgive others. Where there is no forgiveness, there is no community.

There are no quick fixes.

Students often comment, “Didn’t we do diversity last semester?” You cannot “program” your way into a supportive diverse community. You cannot “speak” or “policy” your way into community. Nor can you “train” your way into community. Building community across difference is a life-long learning and unlearning process. We did not get to our current state in a three-hour or day-long time frame. A diversity speaker or program is not going to be the quick fix.

Acknowledge, celebrate, and appreciate progress.

Many people always see the glass as half empty. They operate from a deficit model or framework, mainly perceiving the negative. This mode of operation creates an environment in which diversity is a burden or something that has to be fixed quickly. If we only see the problems and refuse to acknowledge the progress, good work, and effort of the community, we are likely to create a culture of hopelessness. Additionally, we dishonor our predecessors who worked to bring our institutions and organizations to their current levels of success.

Individuals and organizations do grow and change; there is hope.

As a social justice educator, I can say without a doubt that people and organizations do grow and change. I have watched it happen instantly, and I have watched the change happen over five- to ten-year periods. The challenge with culture change is that it is often a slow process that may leave some people feeling little hope. I constantly see young and old, homosexuals and heterosexuals, Christians and followers of other faiths, who are naming, owning, and working to shift the dynamics and ensure all people are treated with the same level of dignity and respect. Within those groups, I see individuals who are healing from internalized oppression and serving as empowered agents of change. All of this reminds me that our work is not complete, but we have done our part to make the planet a better place for all people.

Rev. Jamie Washington, PhD, is the president and founder of the Washington Consulting Group, a multicultural organizational development firm in Baltimore, Maryland. Washington is also a founding faculty member of the Social Justice Training Institute and an associate pastor at Unity Fellowship Church of Baltimore.

APPENDIX E: CAMPUS LIVING, LEARNING, AND WORKING ENVIRONMENT SURVEY EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Prepared by Pa Thao, Institutional Research & Effectiveness

Survey information

The Campus Living, Learning, and Working Environment (CLLWE) survey is a pilot instrument developed by the Higher Education Data-Sharing Consortium (HEDS), a professional association of institutional researchers and assessment specialists from selective liberal arts institutions. HEDS also hosts other surveys St. Olaf administers regularly, such as the Alumni Survey, the First Destination Survey, and the Research Practices Survey. The CLLWE was administered to students, faculty, and staff at St. Olaf in late November and early December 2017. The comparison group consists of respondents from five other liberal arts institutions that administered the pilot in Spring 2017. Results should be interpreted with caution, because the overall response rates both for St. Olaf (28%, including 20% of current students, 47% of faculty, and 47% of staff) and for the other participating institutions (averaging 25%) aren't high enough to know whether the survey respondents are representative of all the invited participants.

The campus as a welcoming environment

- *Overall community satisfaction with both diversity and inclusiveness on campus is decidedly mixed. On balance, just under half of all St. Olaf respondents (49% of students, faculty and staff together) indicated they were “very” or “somewhat” satisfied with campus diversity, and just over half (51%) were “very” or “somewhat” satisfied with campus inclusiveness. Student and faculty responses almost identical to one another and somewhat less positive than staff responses.*
- *Staff are more satisfied than students and faculty with their experience regarding diversity. 61% of staff said they were very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with their campus experience regarding diversity. Faculty and students were more aligned in their responses, with 47% and 46% reporting the same, respectively.*
- *Staff are also more satisfied than students and faculty with their experience regarding inclusiveness. 57% of staff said they were very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with their campus experience/environment regarding inclusiveness. While students reported less satisfaction with diversity (46% from above), they seem to be more satisfied with their campus experience regarding inclusiveness (51% very satisfied or somewhat satisfied). Faculty reported satisfaction with inclusiveness at the same rate as their satisfaction with diversity.*

- *Overwhelmingly, all groups to a great extent or some extent, experience a sense of belonging at St. Olaf.* 85% of students experience a sense of belonging to some extent or a great extent. Staff and faculty reported 85% and 83%, respectively. Only 4% of faculty indicated they feel no sense of belonging at all while 2% of students and 1% of staff reported the same.
- While most participants felt some sense of belonging, their perception of how others experience belonging is that it is different from their own. This is true across the board. Whereas 42% of students indicated that they feel a sense of belonging to a great extent, only 13% said they feel all community members share the same sense of belonging. Whereas 47% of faculty indicated that they feel a sense of belonging to a great extent, only 8% said they feel all community members share the same sense of belonging. And, while 47% of staff indicated that they feel a sense of belonging to a great extent, only 13% said they feel all community members share the same sense of belonging.
- Participants' perceptions of others' sense of belonging seems to be less tied to their own sense of belonging and more to their satisfaction with their campus experience regarding diversity. Staff, who reported the highest level of satisfaction with diversity (61%), also were the most likely to feel that all community members experience a sense of belonging to some or a great extent (78%). Students, who reported the lowest level of satisfaction with diversity (46%), were the least likely to feel that all community members experience a sense belonging to some or a great extent (61%).

Attitudes

- Across the board, all groups at St. Olaf reported the least comfort interacting with people who have a different political affiliation or view. 44% of both faculty and staff reported that they are very comfortable interacting with people who have different political views than they do while 41% of students reported the same.
- While participants may not be comfortable interacting with people who have a different political affiliation, they can work closely and share responsibility with those individuals. 56% of students said they are very comfortable working with others who have different views. 67% of faculty and 65% of staff indicated the same.

Actions

- All groups indicated that they are somewhat or very interested in participating in discussions, training, or activities on racial/ethnic issues. 72% of students said they were somewhat or very interested in this action. 77% of faculty said they were somewhat or very interested and 65% of staff said they were somewhat or very interested. Though all groups reported interest in this action, rates of frequent participation were low. 46% of students said that they participate in

discussions, training, or activities on racial/ethnic issues 6 or more times a year since coming to St. Olaf. 41% of faculty and 23% of staff said the same.

Experiences with diversity

- At St. Olaf, all groups hear someone make an insensitive or disparaging remark about persons with a particular political affiliation/view on a monthly basis or more often. 74% of students said they hear these remarks this often while 64% of faculty and 44% staff said the same thing. For students, the two other topics that often come up are gender (50%) and race/ethnicity (48%). For faculty, remarks about generation (27%) and religion (26%) are commonly heard. Comments on generation (19%), gender (14%) and race/ethnicity (14%) are commonly heard for staff.
- *For the most part, insensitive or disparaging remarks come from peers.* 66% of students said that of the remarks that they hear on a monthly basis or more often, other students are the source of those remarks. 19% of staff said that remarks they hear are from other staff members. Only 22% of faculty reported that remarks come from other faculty while 32% said that these comments are coming from local community members.
- Across all St. Olaf groups, participants are most likely to intervene when derogatory comments or jokes based on people with disabilities are made. 50% of faculty who have observed this behavior almost always intervene in these situations. Of the students who have observed this behavior, 44% said they almost always intervene. 40% of staff said the same.
- Just as all groups are the least comfortable interacting with people who have different political affiliations, they are also less likely to intervene when derogatory comments or jokes are made about a specific political affiliation. Of faculty who have observed this behavior, 19% said they almost always intervene, while 12% of students and 9% of staff said the same.
- Staff and faculty identified that their gender has been the most frequent basis of discrimination or harassment directed at them on campus, at an off-campus residence, or at a college-affiliated event. 44% of students said they've felt discriminated against or harassed monthly or more often based on their gender. 30% of faculty indicated this too. 17% of staff also indicated that they've frequently been discriminated against because of their gender, but 31% said they've felt discriminated against or harassed because of their age/generation on a monthly basis or more.
- *The most frequent form of discrimination or harassment for all groups has been verbal comments.* When asked to consider all instances in which they felt discriminated against or harassed on campus, at an off-campus residence, or at a college-affiliated event, 25% of students said they've experienced verbal comments. This is true for 20% of faculty and 15% of staff. For all three groups, the next most frequent form of discrimination they've experienced has been deliberate exclusion.

- Similar to how St. Olaf groups most often hear insensitive or disparaging remarks from their peers, participants also indicated that they most often feel discriminated or harassed by their peers. 68% of students said that other students were the source of discrimination or harassment on a monthly basis or more. 36% of faculty said other faculty discriminate or harass them while 30% of staff indicated other staff discriminate against or harass them on a monthly basis or more.

Beliefs

- The overwhelming majority of St. Olaf participants agree or strongly agree that diversity improves experiences and interactions within the classroom, workplace and overall community (90% of students, 96% faculty, and 90% staff). However, fewer participants agree that recruitment of historically marginalized students, faculty, and staff is an institutional priority (50% of students, 80% of faculty, 65% staff) and even fewer participants agree that retention of these marginalized groups is an institutional priority (48% of students, 60% faculty, 55% staff).
- The majority of all groups at St. Olaf agree or strongly agree that senior leadership demonstrates commitment to diversity and inclusiveness on campus. Faculty are the most likely to agree; 70% said that they agree that senior leadership demonstrates commitment to diversity and 64% said leadership demonstrates commitment to inclusiveness. Students are least likely to agree; 52% see a demonstrated commitment to diversity while 54% see a demonstrated commitment to inclusiveness.

Reporting

- *Staff and faculty are more aware than are students of the individuals or offices to whom to report acts of discrimination to.* 85% of staff said they know where to report an act of discrimination or harassment. 85% of faculty know while 58% of students said they know.
- *The process for reporting acts of discrimination or harassment is still unclear, particularly for students.* Only 38% of students said they agree or strongly agree that the process is clear. Faculty and staff are more familiar, with 63% and 69%, respectively, reporting that the process is clear.

Comparisons with other participating institutions

Overall, St. Olaf is very similar to its comparison group. Compared to other institutions that participated in the CLLWE, St. Olaf participants expressed similar levels of satisfaction with their campus environment in regards to both diversity and inclusiveness. St. Olaf participants appear to share the same attitudes, expressing the least comfort interacting with the following groups (in no particular order): people with a different political affiliation, transgender people, undocumented immigrants, and non-native English speakers. St. Olaf participants also expressed the strongest interest in and frequently participated in activities related to: diversity, race/ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic status. Verbal comments and deliberate exclusion were cited as the most common forms of discrimination or harassment for both St. Olaf and other institutions. Acts of discrimination most often occur in spaces that groups most often

occupy. For students, these acts most often take place in the classroom, in on campus housing, and in dining halls. For staff and faculty, incidents occur in a department office or conference room, in an individual's office, or at institution-sponsored events.

There is one marked difference between St. Olaf and its comparison group. Students at other institutions were more familiar with reporting protocols. 58% of St. Olaf students agreed or strongly agreed that they know to whom to report an act of discrimination or harassment compared to 64% of students from other institutions. Furthermore, only 38% of St. Olaf students agreed or strongly agreed that the process for reporting acts of discrimination or harassment is clear to them while 51% of students from other institutions reported the same.

APPENDIX F: MICROAGGRESSIONS SURVEY EXECUTIVE SUMMARIES

Prepared by Sociology/Anthropology 371 students

Not So Micro: Microassaults and Environmental Microaggressions in the Classroom

Pearl McAndrews, Meghan Todd, and Arleigh Truesdale

SOAN 371: Foundations of Social Science Research – Quantitative Methods

St. Olaf College, Fall 2017

Executive Summary

In the fall of 2017, the Sociology/Anthropology 371 students conducted research on racialized microaggressions in St. Olaf College classrooms. We sent an anonymous online survey to 2,844 students and received 718 responses, a 25.2% response rate. Our sample reflects many demographics of the student body, and it matches the general standard for a sample of a population of approximately 3,000 (10%-30% response rate; Neuman 2012).

Prior studies have identified racial microaggressions as existing on various systemic levels: cultural, individual, and institutional. Microaggressions, subtle yet ubiquitous forms of racism, are instances of verbal, behavioral, or environmental slights which intentionally or unintentionally target persons from minoritized communities (Museus and Park 2015, Minikel-Lacocque 2013, Solórzano et al. 2000). Our research focuses on two sub-categories of microaggressions: microassaults, defined as conscious small-scale verbal or behavioral attacks meant to harm or degrade a person of color; and environmental microaggressions, which are macroscopic or institutional manifestations of covert racism. Our main questions are:

1. What kinds of microassaults happen in St. Olaf classrooms?
2. Who commits microassaults in St. Olaf classrooms?
3. In which types of classes are microaggressions most likely to occur at St. Olaf (e.g. lecture-based vs. discussion-based, STEM vs. Humanities, etc.)?

The most important results of our research are the following:

- 42.8% of respondents reported having experienced or observed a fellow student mock language styles or imitate accents at least once in the first 11 weeks of the semester.
- 39.7% of respondents indicated that they had experienced/observed a student tell a joke that mocked or degraded a racial/ethnic group(s) or a nationality group(s).
- Students of color were more than twice as likely to report having observed/experienced another student using a racial slur to address or refer to a student of color (21.9%) than white students (10.0%) (Cramer's $V=0.147$, $p<.05$).

- 10.3% of respondents indicated that they had experienced or observed a professor mock language styles or imitate accents at least once this semester.
- Students of color were almost twice as likely to report having observed/experienced a professor telling a joke that mocked or degraded a racial/ethnic group(s) (13.2%) than white students (7.0%) (Cramer's $V = 0.091$, $p < .05$).
- 29.7% reported having observed or experienced a microaggression "during group work with other students;" 25.4% "during a lecture;" and 37.3% "during a class discussion."

Based on our research, we offer the following recommendations:

1. Provide training for students and professors that focuses on understanding what is included as racism and racialized microaggressions.
2. Create and publish an explicit campus policy regarding hate speech, derogatory language, and the display of racist symbols on campus.
3. Provide funding and resources to increase the number of students and faculty of color, thereby also contributing to a more positive learning environment and a decrease in environmental racism.
4. Provide training for all professors in all departments to be able to discuss racial microaggressions effectively and mitigate their prevalence and effects. This should help alleviate the burden on professors of color or professors from departments that deal with issues surrounding race, social identity, and social inequality.

Microinsults in St. Olaf Classrooms

Emma Beahler, Kellis Brandt, Michelle Olson, and Anna Perkins

SOAN 371: Foundations of Social Science Research – Quantitative Methods

St. Olaf College, Fall 2017

Executive Summary

In the fall of 2017, the Sociology/Anthropology 371 course conducted research on racial microaggressions in the classroom. We sent an anonymous online survey to 2,844 students at St. Olaf College. We received 718 responses, a 25.2% response rate, which fits with the general rule for a sample from a population of about 3,000 (Neuman 2012).

Prior studies of microaggressions have focused on the experiences of students and faculty of specific racial and ethnic demographic groups at a variety of institutions of higher education. The study conducted by SOAN371 focuses on proactive and reactive responses to microaggressions against students in the classroom, microaggressions in course materials and curriculum, and the impacts of microaggressions on students. Using a typology from Sue et al. (2007), we examined four types of microaggressions including microinvalidations, microassaults, environmental microaggressions, and microinsults, the topic of our team's research. Our research focuses on three questions: How often do microinsults occur in classes at St.

Olaf (when perpetrated by students and by professors)? What types of microinsults occur in St. Olaf classrooms? Who are the main targets of microinsults?

The most important results of our research are:

- People who observed or experienced any specific type of microaggression were likely to also observe or experience other types of microaggressions.
- Students of color are more likely to report observing or experiencing microinsults than white students.
- International students are more likely to report observing or experiencing microinsults than domestic students.
- Students with natural science/mathematics, fine arts, and humanities majors were more likely to observe or experience professor-to-student microinsults than students with majors in departments and programs outside of those divisions.
- 59.9% of respondents have observed or experienced a student stating or implying a racial, ethnic, or national stereotype about a group of people at least once in the first 11 weeks of this fall semester.
- 35.5% of respondents reported observing a professor focusing uninvited attention on a student of color or international student at least once.
- Female-identifying students were more likely to report observing or experiencing microinsults perpetrated by *both* professors and students than were male-identifying students.

Based on our research, we offer three recommendations:

1. Require mandatory training for all professors on racial and ethnic microinsults. Provide them with strategies to prevent, recognize, and respond effectively to microinsults from students and from themselves.
2. Hold regular workshops to give professors the tools to facilitate productive, respectful discussions about race in their classrooms, regardless of their department. Include anti-racist competency on end-of-semester student feedback surveys and faculty reviews.
3. Provide “Mandatory racial and cultural sensitivity training” for all students (The Collective’s Demand, 1B), using a more effective provider than DiversityEdu.

Microinvalidations in St. Olaf Academic Spaces

Rachel Bongart, Nikki Lewis, Juni Lie, Nicklaus Schieffelbein

SOAN 371: Foundations of Social Science Research – Quantitative Methods

St. Olaf College, Fall 2017

Executive Summary

In the fall of 2017, students in Sociology/Anthropology 371 conducted research on microaggressions in classrooms and the curriculum at St. Olaf College, including their manifestations, impacts, proactive and

retroactive responses. We sent an anonymous online survey to 2,844 students at St. Olaf College. We received 718 responses, a 25.2% response rate.

Racism has persisted in our society and institutions despite legal changes aimed at outlawing it. Much contemporary racism occurs in more covert and implicit forms than in the past. In 1970 Chester Pierce coined the term “racialized microaggressions,” and Sue et al. (2007) later created a typology of its varied forms: microassaults, microinsults, microinvalidations and environmental microaggressions. Our research focuses on the various manifestations and frequencies of *microinvalidations* in St. Olaf academic spaces. Microinvalidations describe often unconscious microaggressions that ignore, neutralize or negate the lived experiences and emotional realities of racially, ethnically and nationally underrepresented students. Examples include denying white privilege or suggesting that racism doesn’t exist anymore.

The most important results of our research are the following:

- Racial microinvalidations occur across *all* academic spaces, even SPMs (Studies in Physical Movement) and labs, as well as across classroom structures, such as discussion- and lecture-based courses.
- 72% of students reported having observed at least one student-to-student microinvalidation in an academic space within the first 11 weeks of the semester.
- The 28% of students who reported never seeing any student-to-student microinvalidations in class in the first 11 weeks were disproportionately white students, suggesting that many white students may simply not notice the microinvalidations that occur around them.
- Students reported observing more student-to-student than professor-to-student microinvalidations. However, 35% of respondents reported seeing at least one professor-to-student microinvalidation in an academic space in the first 11 weeks of the semester.
- Students of color tended to score higher on our student-to-student microinvalidation index (a summary measure of six types of microinvalidations) than white students. Students of color are more likely to observe (notice) or be the target of microinvalidations as compared to white students.

Based on our research, we recommend that the college find ways to educate students and professors on microinvalidations and effective ways of responding to them, such as how to challenge racial and ethnic stereotypes when they occur and how to increase consciousness about personal biases (Harwood et al. 2015). Our data and prior scholarship suggest that microinvalidations occur more often than many white students realize, perhaps including the microinvalidations they themselves perpetrate, and that microinvalidations are enacted by students and professors alike. Therefore, we recommend that the college add in-depth education on microaggressions to supplement the current education on diversity and inclusion, such as Diversity.edu and Sustained Dialogues.

“He didn’t really say that, right?”: The Impacts of Racial Microaggressions in Learning Environments

Manuel Cardoza, Isabel Galic, and Rita Thorsen

In the fall of 2017, the Sociology/Anthropology 371 course conducted research on racial microaggressions in classes and curricula. We sent an anonymous online survey to 2844 students at St. Olaf College. We received 718 responses, a 25.2% response rate.

Prior studies have found that racial microaggressions (MAs) alienate students of color from their learning environments, causing physiological and psychological stress and worsening their academic experiences (Harwood 2013, Harper 2015, Smith et al. 2007). Our research focuses on three main questions:

1. How do MAs impact students' psycho-emotional well-being?
2. How do MAs impact classroom social dynamics?
3. How do MAs impact student learning outcomes?

The most important results of our research are:

- 86.5% students reported being negatively impacted to some degree by microaggressions in the classroom.
- 65.4% of students who observe *and* students who are targeted by racialized microaggressions report negative academic impacts, indicating microaggressions affect more than just the person targeted.
- Of the respondents who reported witnessing or experiencing microaggressions, 73.2% report negative impacts on their psycho-emotional well-being. As targets, students of color are significantly more negatively impacted than white students, scoring 26.4% below the expected no impact point.
- Microaggressions negatively impact relationships with classmates and professors of students of color, who scored on average 14.6% lower than white students on a 15-point index.

Based on our research, we offer four recommendations:

1. The school should work to validate the experiences of those who are impacted by microaggressions in the classroom in response to the common belief that microaggressions do not exist and that students targeted by them are overreacting.
2. Professors and students should make an effort to establish personal relationships in classrooms to allow targeted and observing students to respond and process to microaggressions. This should be addressed at the very beginning of the semester.
3. Professors should be educated and committed to stop enacting MAs themselves and to address student-to-student and curricular MAs.
4. Services addressing the psycho-emotional and academic well-being of students should be expanded in accordance with To Include Is to Excel's goal that education "raise no bars to particular groups of students." The school should encourage students who are not diagnosed with

a learning disability or mental illness but suffer from the effects of racialized microaggressions to access support.

Immediate and Short-term Reactions to Racialized Microaggressions in the Classroom at St. Olaf College

Frank Delaney, Grace Jackson, and Claire Mumford

SOAN 371: Foundations of Social Science Research – Quantitative Methods

St. Olaf College, Fall 2017

Executive Summary

In the fall of 2017, the Sociology/Anthropology 371 students conducted research on racialized microaggressions in college classrooms. We sent an anonymous online survey to 2,844 students at St. Olaf College. We received 718 responses, a 25.2% response rate. Our sample reflects many demographics of the student body, and it matches the general rule of thumb of 20-25% for a sample size of a population of approximately 3,000 (Neumann 2012).

Prior studies have found that microaggressions are “characterized by ambiguity” and therefore often go unaddressed on college campuses (Ford 2011, Boysen 2012). Moreover, scholars have found that professors and students respond to microaggressions in a myriad of ways (Harper 2013, Salazar 2009, Solorzano 2000). We focused our research on responses to microaggressions in the classroom. Our research questions are as follows:

- How do students respond to racial/ethnic microaggressions in the classroom?
- Do they respond differently based on their position as a target or as an observer? Do they respond differently based on being a student of color or a white student?
- How do professors respond to racial/ethnic microaggressions in the classroom?
- Which responses to microaggressions do students view as most effective and which do they view as least effective? How does this compare to how students and professors actually respond?

The most important results of our research are:

- Of the students of color, 38 (29.9%) report they were the target of a racial/ethnic microaggression in the classroom during the first 11 weeks of this semester. Of the respondents answering this question, 227 (38.4%) said they observed and/or were targeted by a racial microaggression in the classroom this semester.
- The most common student response to microaggressions was nonverbal (64.7%).
- The least common student responses to microaggressions were reporting to faculty/staff/administration (2.9%) and using the Community Bias Incident form (0.7%).
- The most common responses of professors were ignoring, staying silent, or changing the subject when a microaggression occurred (36.1%).

- Students report the most effective way to respond to microaggressions is to confront the enactor gently/asking questions (62.3%), and the least effective ways are to confront the enactor forcefully/yelling (49.6%) and to stay silent/ignore the microaggression (48.5%)

Based on our research, we offer three recommendations:

1. Provide in-depth training for faculty and staff to recognize microaggressions (including those in the classroom) and respond to them effectively.
2. Provide better training for students to recognize and address microaggressions in the classroom.
3. Provide clear and effective mechanisms for official reporting and/or tracking microaggressions in classrooms. The Community Bias Incident form is not utilized for most microaggressions and tends to be seen by students as neither appropriate nor effective, so the college should recognize that this mode of reporting does not reflect the actual rate of microaggressions in St. Olaf classrooms, despite the harm to students.

Reducing Racism: Proactive Measures to Mitigate Racialized Microaggressions in College Classrooms

Maddy Chiu, Olive Dwan, Khadijah Gowdy, and Ann Jensen

SOAN 371: Foundations of Social Science Research – Quantitative Methods

St. Olaf College, Fall 2017

Executive Summary

In fall 2017, students in Sociology/Anthropology 371 conducted research on racial microaggressions in the classroom and curricula at St. Olaf College. We sent an anonymous online survey to all students on campus (except ourselves), a total of 2,844. We received 718 responses (25.2%). Standard guidelines suggest a sampling ratio of 30% for a population of 1,000; for our slightly larger population, a response rate of 25.2% is appropriate (Neuman 2012:167).

Prior studies of racism in college classrooms have identified patterns of racialized microaggressions (MAs) and their damaging impacts, which undermine the goals of higher education institutions, endanger the well-being of students of color, and hinder the full engagement of all students in dialogue and critical inquiry. However, scholarship has focused on MA terminology, targets and enactors, and responses, without specifically addressing ways that professors and institutions can proactively limit their occurrence in classrooms.

Our research focuses on this gap by addressing two main questions:

1. What actions do professors take in classrooms to limit or prevent racial microaggressions and frequency, and what are students' views of their effectiveness?
2. How effective have initiatives *outside* of the classroom, such as Sustained Dialogue and DiversityEdu, been in limiting or preventing racial MAs *inside* the classroom?

The most important results of our research are:

1. Overall, students perceive actions taken by the professor *inside* the classroom to be more effective in limiting the occurrence of microaggressions in the classroom, as compared to actions taken *outside* of the classroom.
2. A majority of students surveyed (53.4%) report not being in a course this semester in which the professor used the term microaggression (53.4%) or initiated a discussion on how to respond to microaggressions (66.7%), at least not by week 12.
3. While there is some variation in departments including discussions of or using the term “microaggression” in class, it appears that no department does these things frequently.
4. Respondents view professor-initiated discussions of racism as the most effective proactive action, and these discussions are more often focused on class materials and less often connected to campus or societal events.
5. The majority of respondents perceived outside-the-classroom proactive responses to be at least somewhat effective, with the exception of DiversityEdu Training and its Follow-Up Dialogues, which the majority of students reported as “not at all effective”.

Based on our research, we offer three recommendations:

1. Increase the frequency of all of the professor-initiated proactive responses included in our survey, as respondents found them generally effective but infrequent.
2. Increase professor-initiated discussions of racism in relation to class materials and to campus and societal events, as students view these actions to be the most effective.
3. Create an in-person course that explicitly addresses issues of racism and microaggressions, and integrate this content into curriculum across the campus.

Racism in the Classroom and Its Effect on Student Academic Choices

Jenna Castillo, Chase Koob, Abby Olson, Maria Jacquelyn Quispe

SOAN 371: Foundations of Social Science Research – Quantitative Methods

St. Olaf College, Fall 2017

Executive Summary

In the fall of 2017, the Sociology/Anthropology 371 students conducted research on racism and racialized microaggressions in St. Olaf classrooms and curriculum. We sent an anonymous online survey to 2,844 students, about 11 weeks into the semester, receiving 718 responses, a 25.32 response rate. Our sample reflects many demographics of the student body, and it matches the general rule of thumb for a sample of a population of approximately 3,000.

Prior studies have found that the cumulative effects of racialized microaggressions on college campuses harm the emotional, psychological, and physical well-being of students of color and hinder their academic and social lives. However, little prior research examines the relationship between a college’s curriculum and the presence of racial microaggressions. Our research focuses on four key questions: 1) In students’ views, to what extent and in what ways does the curriculum include racially diverse voices and

perspectives? 2) To what extent are racially diverse perspectives integrated vs. tokenized in the curriculum? 3) Which students participate in classroom discussions of racially diverse works or of issues of racism in the classroom? 4) How does the absence of racially diverse perspectives affect students' academic choices?

The most important results of our research include:

- The vast majority of respondents, 90.4% (497), reported having participated in at least “a few” or more discussions of race or racism. However, 9.6% (53) reported “never or almost never” actively participating in these discussions in their classes.
- 58.8% of respondents (324) report “never or almost never” feeling expected to participate in these discussions more than other students. However, 70.3% (274) of white students “never or almost never” feel this compared to 23.4% (25) of students of color. Moreover, 26.2% (28) of students of color feel expected to participate more than other students in “all or almost all” classroom discussions of race and racism.
- Nearly 20% of respondents report that they felt shut down from participating in *at least* “some of the discussions” of race or racism in the classroom.
- 40% of respondents reported that different aspects of diversity in the classroom have “never or almost never” affected their registration choices. Additionally, almost 10% reported that they “didn’t or didn’t want to register for a class” 5 times or more because they didn’t believe the professor was adequately equipped to address microaggressions.

Based on our research, we offer four recommendations to St. Olaf College:

1. Based on the impact of the race and training of professors on students' registration decisions, we suggest that the college take steps to hire more faculty of color.
2. Based on our findings regarding student participation in discussions, we recommend that all professors provide anonymous feedback forms for students to respond to at multiple points in the semester, regarding course content, its presentation, and class discussions.
3. Based on the findings outlined previously and as a more proactive effort, the college should establish a required first-year seminar in which students study and explore issues of identity, power, privilege, intersectionality, and contextualized history, as well as the role of intersectionality in diversity.
4. Based on all of our findings, the institution as a whole should redefine what diversity means to the college and how it is used in the college's policies, programs, and promotional materials. The language of diversity used by the college neglects intersectionality and its impacts on individuals and the community.

Transformative Pedagogy: The Role of Curricula in Challenging Racism at St. Olaf

Tim Bergeland, Katie Opperman, Xinyi Zhang

Executive Summary

In the fall of 2017, students in Sociology/Anthropology 371 conducted research on racism as it manifests in classrooms at St. Olaf College. We sent an anonymous online survey to 2,844 students and received 718 responses, a 25.2% response rate. Our sample reflects many demographics of the student body, and it matches the general rule of thumb for a sample of a population of approximately 3,000.

Prior studies have found that racial microaggressions occur frequently on college campuses and are harmful to students and faculty of color. Moreover, scholars emphasize that academic curricula can challenge such tendencies, prompting students to be more conscious of structural inequalities and empowering students to work toward dismantling racist social structures. Our research focuses on three main questions:

1. To what extent do students report that racially/ethnically marginalized voices are included within material in their majors, concentrations, and conversation programs?
2. Based on their own experience, which academic departments, concentrations, and conversation programs do students view as most effective in including voices and perspectives from racially/ethnically marginalized groups?
3. To what extent do students report their major as supporting them in starting or continuing to fulfill STOG goals, specifically that of “Responsible Engagement”?

The most important results of our research are the following:

- For their own majors, concentrations, and conversation programs, approximately 33% of students reported that “None or Almost None” of course content included voices from racially/ethnically marginalized groups.
- For each indicator measuring STOG outcomes, approximately 20% of students reported that their major provided no support for them in achieving these outcomes.
- Students tended to reference Humanities (HUM) and Social Science (SS) departments when asked about which department is most effective in including racially/ethnically marginalized perspectives within course content; they tended to exclude Natural Sciences and Mathematics (NSM) and Fine Arts (FA) departments.
- Students with NSM majors tended to report lower STOG fulfillment than those without NSM majors, while students with SS, HUM, and FA majors tended to report higher STOG fulfillment than those without these majors.

Based on our research, we offer three recommendations:

1. Evaluate General Education requirements to ensure that all students experience curricula that centers voices from racially/ethnically marginalized groups and cultivates understanding of racism as it manifests institutionally, societally, and systemically.

2. Modify departmental review processes to include evaluation of the extent to which students in each major learn how their discipline relates to racial injustice, so that all students have ample opportunity to fulfill the STOGGoal of “Responsible Engagement”.
3. Increase awareness of the specific content of STOGGoals, so students are able to understand relevant outcomes and measure themselves and their academic experiences against these standards.

APPENDIX G: REFERENCES

“Core Concepts.” Racial Equity Tools. Center for Assessment and Policy Development. racialequitytools.org/fundamentals/core-concepts/racism.

Earlham College. “Principles and Practices.” earlham.edu/about/mission-beliefs/principles-practices.

Dartmouth College. “Inclusive Excellence.” inclusive.dartmouth.edu.

Glaude, Jr., Eddie. *Democracy in Black: How Race Still Enslaves the American Soul*. New York: Crown, 2016.

Lewis, Earl and Nancy Cantor, eds. *Our Compelling Interests: The Value of Diversity for Democracy and a Prosperous Society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press and Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, 2016.

Philips, Katherine W. “How Diversity Makes Us Smarter: Being Around People Who are Different from Us Makes Us More Creative, More Diligent, and Harder-Working.” *Scientific American*. October 1, 2014. scientificamerican.com/article/how-diversity-makes-us-smarter.

President’s Advisory Committee on Diversity. *Lighting the Path to 2025: A Vision for Diversity*. Pomona College. April 30, 2015. pomona.edu/administration/diversity/presidents-advisory-committee-diversity-pacd.

Princeton University. “Many Voices, One Future.” inclusive.princeton.edu.

“Responding to Campus Protests.” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. October 27, 2016. chronicle.com/resource/responding-to-campus-protests/6127.

Shapiro, Judith. “Seeing the World Through Different Eyes.” *Inside Higher Ed*. December 17, 2015. insidehighered.com/views/2015/12/17/racial-inequality-campuses-must-be-dealt-many-different-fronts-essay.

Smith College. “Anti-Racism Commitment.” smith.edu/ssw/about/anti-racism-commitment.

Smith, Daryl G. *Diversity’s Promise for Higher Education: Making It Work*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2nd Ed. 2015.

Trustee Ad Hoc Committee. “On Diversity.” Princeton University. September 2013. inclusive.princeton.edu/initiatives/ad-hoc-committee.

University of California, Berkeley. *Pathway to Excellence: Strategic Plan for Equity, Inclusion and Diversity*. 2009. diversity.berkeley.edu/about/strategic-plan.