Presidential Task Force on Campus Climate
Final Report of the Campus Experience Subcommittee
June 8, 2018

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In September of 2017, President Pollack announced the formation of the Presidential Task Force on Campus Climate to conduct an in-depth study of campus experience, the regulation of speech and responses to bias incidents. The members of the task force were selected and announced at the beginning of December. The subcommittees of the task force formally began their work at the end of January 2018 once community members returned to campus after winter session.

The subcommittee on the campus experience was charged with the following questions:

1) What, and how well, are we currently doing to promote an inclusive campus experience for our diverse community, both inside and outside the classroom?
2) How can we improve the effectiveness of the resources and systems currently in place?
3) What new resources and changes should be considered as we strive to achieve real inclusion in our campus experience?
4) Provide a recommendation for an ongoing mechanism that will address diversity and inclusion issues.

In an effort to answer these questions, we began by collecting and reviewing relevant university reports, dashboards and survey results. We also read through the *Toward New Destinations (TND)* goals submitted by units across the university and tried to ascertain which of those goals have been accomplished.

Based on our review, we developed a list of questions to direct our outreach to faculty, staff and students. In total, we participated in over 200 separate conversations with a broad cross-section of community members. Meetings ranged in size from one-on-one meetings to groups of up to 100 individuals. We summarized the key ideas from each of these meetings and used this valuable feedback to inform our final recommendations. We also collected data through an online survey developed by members of the task force. The survey instrument included a mix of Likert-type and open-ended questions. We read through and categorized all written comments in order to identify the most dominant themes and selected quotations to include throughout the report.

Our findings and recommendations are organized into eight sections. We first provide a statement of the specific problems/challenges that we identified, then follow with our recommendations; we chose this structure based on the recognition that there may be alternative means of addressing the challenges other than those that we recommend.

Our intent was to provide specific ideas that are actionable, some of which may require additional thought and planning by a working group, and others which may be more straightforward. The inspiration for each recommendation came directly from our outreach and data collection. However, we tried our best to vet each idea by collecting additional information and talking to the stakeholders who would be impacted by the recommendation, either as implementers or recipients.

Overall, we were quite surprised by the degree of similarity between our findings and those that were included in a 2014 climate study conducted by Dr. Sylvia Hurtado (see Appendix 1). The similarity of our findings provides assurance about their validity but also confirms frustrations expressed by community members about the slow rate of change. In our outreach conversations, many people asked whether the recommendations from the Hurtado report had been implemented. To our knowledge, many of them remain unaddressed, at least in a concrete and visible way.

We found it useful to consider what factors might account for the apparent lack of implementation of many of the 2014 recommendations. We concluded that a complex mix of the following factors are at play:

a) *commitment* – insufficient or inconsistent commitment among senior leaders;
b) *accountability* – often a symptom of weak leader commitment to stated goals and, in turn, an explanation for weak commitment throughout the institution;
c) *capacity* – insufficient human or financial resources to accomplish the work;
d) *capability* – in some cases there may be sufficient capacity, but without needed capability or expertise;
e) *structure* – structural inefficiencies and barriers, including organizational boundaries, archaic or disconnected technological tools, and physical structures;
f) *communication* – in some cases change appears to be occurring but remains invisible due to weak communication.

Of these, the most common problems we encountered had to do with accountability, structure and communication. In large part because of the decentralized structure of the university, diversity and inclusion efforts to date have remained fragmented and uncoordinated. As a result, we found that the whole is often less than the sum of the parts. We suspect that in some cases, better communication could help bring about greater coherence and impact. However, systematic change will remain unlikely without much stronger systems of accountability.

We recognize, of course, that many of the recommendations included in this report will have at least some resource implications. It will be important to choose from among them carefully. Those actions that will be most visibly felt by the community should take priority, with careful consideration of how alignment among the chosen actions can amplify impact.

With that said, we are certain that substantial investments in diversity and inclusion must continue to be made by the university, much as is the case at our peer institutions. During the

Scheinman community meetings that led up to the selection of task force members, many people expressed the concern that the university might not devote sufficient financial resources to implement recommendations and that, therefore, the task force would end up being another exercise in futility that wasted the time of hardworking volunteers.

It is imperative that the senior administration communicate clearly and frequently with the university community about actions that are taken based on the work of the task force. Students, staff and faculty alike requested that a rubric for tracking and communicating progress be adopted to enhance transparency and awareness (see Figure 1 for an example). We recommend that President Pollack use multiple channels to communicate with the community about the recommended changes that she intends to implement, ideally with associated timelines, and follow up with periodic progress updates.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Those recommendations that we believe should be implemented immediately are marked with an asterisk*; intermediate goals with two asterisks**; and aspirational goals with three asterisks***.

Section A: Strengthening Community Identification

Problem/challenge to be addressed (A.1). To renew our collective sense of purpose, the university needs to develop a compact of our core values that can be used as a framework for articulating the behavioral standards we expect of community members and the educational opportunities in which we will focus our investments.

> **Recommendation A.1 – Core Values Campaign*** Launch a core values campaign to ensure that members of our campus community have a clear understanding of the core values that make Cornell distinct.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (A.2): Not only does the university need to strengthen our collective identity by clarifying what it means, it also needs to provide more opportunities for people to have a shared experience, particularly through community-wide events.

> **Recommendation A.2. – Inclusive community events*** Sponsor more events that are open to the entire community, ideally ones that celebrate what is distinctive about Cornell.

Section B: The Organizing Structure for the University's Diversity and Inclusion Goals

Problem/challenge to be addressed (B1): Despite the substantial investments made in diversity and inclusion across campus, decentralization and fragmentation inhibit impact and visibility. The university has an urgent need for more intentional connectivity and collaboration across units that do not depend on the goodwill of the university diversity officers (UDOs) to do extra work in their "spare time."

Recommendation B1.1 – Dedicated Professional Staff to Unify Decentralized Efforts* Create a new professional staff position for someone whose sole responsibility would be to oversee the revision and expansion of the TND initiative.

Recommendation B.1.2 – Increase Discretionary Funds for the University Diversity Council* Increase discretionary funds to support university-level activities that do not squarely fall within the domain of any one UDO, and to equip the UDC with the needed agility to respond to community needs as they emerge.

Recommendation B1.3 – Guide TND with Institutional-level Goals* Identify a limited number of specific, measurable institutional-level goals each year (or over another defined timeframe), to which units should link local efforts.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (B2): There is a need for well-understood accountability mechanisms as well as channels for voice and communication to the president and provost about campus climate and diversity issues.

Recommendation B.2.1 – UDC Connection to both President and Provost* Within the existing UDC structure, designate a chair at both the UDO and executive levels. Have the executive chair represent diversity and inclusion issues in both the president's cabinet and provost's staff meetings.

Recommendation B.2.2 – College-level leadership*** Faculty in positions of influence should be formally integrated into the diversity leadership structure within each college.

Recommendation B.2.3 – Communication of TND Goals* Require units to communicate their TND goals with their constituent members (e.g., on college website, with students, staff, faculty and alumni).

Recommendation B.2.4 – Student Advisory Board to the UDC** Create a Student Advisory Board to the UDC to serve as a formal mechanism through which students can discuss ongoing diversity and inclusion issues with senior administrators.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (B3): Diversity and inclusion are not sufficiently integrated with the core research and teaching mission of the university.

Recommendation B.3 – Department-level TND Goals** Push the TND process down to the level of academic department so that diversity goal setting is directly linked to our educational mission.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (B4): Despite the fact that university has developed a diversity dashboard that contains a wide range of useful information (and for which it is widely regarded as a leader among peer institutions), the data are underutilized, in part because few people are aware of its existence and know how to access it.

Recommendation B.4.1 – Push Diversity Scorecard Data to Units * Collect, analyze and disseminate diversity analytics to TND units for use in developing goals and monitoring progress against those goals.

Recommendation B.4.2 – Revise the Diversity Scorecard * Establish a Diversity Assessment Advisory Group consisting of faculty and professional staff to evaluate and revise the components and construct definitions included in the diversity scorecard.

Section C: Raising Awareness Through Better Communication

Problem/challenge to be addressed (C.1): Community members have trouble finding information about available resources and initiatives.

Recommendation C.1.1 – Central Portal and App for Finding Resources* Prioritize the development of a "Find Your Resource" platform that is comprehensive, easy to navigate and searchable, ideally with an accompanying mobile app version.

Recommendation C.1.2 – Dynamic Messaging** Push news and stories out to the community.

Recommendation C.1.3 – Social Media* Utilize social media channels to communicate with students in an effort to reduce response times and be more nimble.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (C.2): Awareness of, and likelihood of using, available resources for addressing bias incidents is especially low, as is the utilization of information collected to inform future actions.

Recommendation C.2.1 – Education about Bias Reporting* Increase awareness about what constitutes bias and prohibited conduct, including how to report it, and the specific factors that influence the sequence of steps that follow.

Recommendation C.2.2 – Revisions to Bias Reporting System* Conduct a careful review of the Maxient form that is used to collect information about a specific incident and make revisions that will improve the quality of reporting that is possible.

Recommendation C.2.3 – Responses to Bias Incidents* Develop clear guidelines for the review team about appropriate responses, including who should be informed about what types of incidents.

Recommendation C.2.4 – Develop a Plan for Sharing Aggregate Data about Bias* Develop a task force to work through reporting and legal details associated with publishing available information about bias incidents and sexual misconduct.

Section D: Diversity Education

Problem/challenge to be addressed (D.1): Existing providers of diversity education on campus operate in isolation without a coordinated strategy.

> **Recommendation D.1 – Umbrella Structure for Diversity Education**** Establish an umbrella structure (e.g., "Inclusive Leadership Academy @ Cornell") for diversity education across the university, with the goal of reducing uncoordinated redundancy and instead enabling a synergistic collaborative approach.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (D.2): When individuals in positions of authority do not visibly support community members' participation in diversity training, it generates resentment and confusion, and weakens messages about the value of diversity and inclusion to the university.

> **Recommendation D.2 – Visible Leader Support for Diversity Education*** Ensure that there is visible top-down support for diversity education, beginning with the president and cascading down through all levels of leadership.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (D.3): Despite the fact that we can reliably predict that every student will continue to face diversity in their workplaces and communities throughout their lives, Cornell hast not yet committed to providing all students with at least some minimum level of preparation for engaging effectively with a diverse world.

> **Recommendation D.3 – Institute a Diversity Course Requirement**** Institute a university-wide diversity course requirement, with carefully developed guidelines about the types of courses that can fulfill the requirement.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (D4): At a time when societal-level tensions are exacerbating felt divisions among community members, there is a greater need than ever for students, faculty and staff to be able to engage in effective dialogue with people who hold different views and come from different backgrounds. This is especially true in response to trigger events.

> **Recommendation D.4.1 – Mandatory Dialogue-based Orientation Workshops*** Replace our historical approach of content/awareness-based diversity training during new student orientation with skills-based training, particularly about how to engage in effective dialogue across difference.

> **Recommendation D.4.2 – Reinforce Orientation Training*** Reinforce the impact of what students learn through Intergroup Dialogue Project (IDP) orientation workshops by training students in key positions of influence using the same IDP-based framework.

> **Recommendation D.4.3 – Parallel Training for Residential Leaders**** Provide parallel workshops to faculty, staff and student advisors on North and West Campus so that they reinforce what students have learned by adopting similar language and dialogue tools to

facilitate difficult conversations and resolve conflicts within students' living and learning communities.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (D.5): Hundreds of teaching assistants interact directly with undergraduate students in the classroom each semester, yet only some of them receive TA training.

Recommendation D.5 – Guarantee TA training** Guarantee that teaching assistants, many of whom have little or no prior teaching experience, received structured orientation prior to assuming their roles.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (D.6): There is disagreement and confusion among faculty about what their role is and is not when it comes to responding to bias incidents.

Recommendation D.6.1 – Communicate Expectations for Faculty Response to Bias Incidents* Clarify for faculty that the most important thing they can do for students is to demonstrate empathy and show that they care for the well-being of students.

Recommendation D.6.2 – Raise Faculty Awareness about Professional Support for Students* On an annual basis, (re-)educate faculty about available student support resources on campus.

Recommendation D.6.3 – Deliver Short Workshops to Faculty in Their Academic Homes* Increase faculty exposure to diversity education by bringing it to them rather than relying on them to seek it.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (D.7): Many staff are interested in learning more about minoritized identity groups. However, not all of these staff feel supported by their supervisors to participate in workshops or have not yet sought out relevant workshops.

Recommendation D.7.1 – Require Diversity Education for Student-Facing Staff** Although all staff with an interest in raising their awareness about different identity groups and developing skills should be actively supported to do so, student-facing staff should be required to participate in diversity education on an annual basis.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (D.8): We also learned in our discussions with student advisors that there is no standardized approach for training staff who are hired into advising roles.

Recommendation D.8.1 – Develop Protocol for Onboarding Student Services Staff* Convene a group to examine existing training and professional development practices of student advisors across the university, conduct a training needs assessment, and devise a coordinated strategy to be deployed in the 2019-20 academic year.

Recommendation D.8.2 – Establish Structured Professional Network of Student Services Staff* Designate a point person for overseeing the development of a structured professional network of student services staff. Allocate a budget for supporting professional development activities and quarterly network meetings.

Section E: Assessment of Inclusive Leadership and Pedagogy

Problem/challenge to be addressed (E.1): Faculty and staff who themselves belong to minoritized identity groups tend to take on a disproportionate amount of unrecognized work associated with supporting students, serving on committees and contributing to initiatives that promote community.

Recommendation E.1.1 – Formal Rewards*** Establish presidential grants for faculty who do a disproportionate amount of this work. Allow use of funds to buy-out of course, apply toward research or pay summer salary.

Recommendation E.1.2 – University-wide Awards* Establish presidential awards to recognize faculty, staff and students from across the university who have contributed in exemplary ways to improve campus climate.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (E.2): Treatment by one's manager [instructor] has an enormous impact on experiences of inclusion, both positive and negative, but there currently are not adequate mechanisms in place for capturing the quality of supervision [teaching] and responding appropriately to both excellent and poor leadership.

Recommendation E.2 – Expand Use of 360° Performance Evaluations** Expand both the content and usage of 360° performance evaluation to ensure that employees have a safe mechanism for providing feedback about the quality of their workgroup climate and treatment by their manager. Develop clear guidelines about how both exceptional and problematic leadership will be identified and recognized.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (E.3): Unless faculty receive a clear message that promoting an inclusive campus experience through their teaching and service represents an important criterion for evaluating faculty excellence, efforts to promote diversity and inclusion will be shouldered by an overburdened minority of faculty and progress will be slow.

Recommendation E.3.1 – Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure** Revise faculty guidelines for promotion and tenure so that descriptions of "excellence" in teaching and service explicitly describe the importance of promoting inclusion in the classroom and in the Cornell community.

Recommendation E.3.2 – "Contributions to Diversity and Inclusion" Statement in Application Materials* Require applicants for faculty (and administrative) positions to include a statement in their application materials about contributions to diversity and inclusion.

Recommendation E.3.3 – Annual "Contributions to Diversity and Inclusion" Updates** Require faculty to include a diversity and inclusion statement in both their annual reports and in tenure and promotion materials.

Recommendation E.3.4 – Teaching Evaluations** Convene a task force of experts in assessment, instructional methods and learning outcomes to carefully review the teaching evaluations currently used across colleges and recommend revisions to be adopted immediately.

Section F: Enhancing Social Belonging and Engagement Across Difference

Problem/challenge to be addressed (F.1): There continue to be perceived inequities in access to academic and professional development opportunities that need to be addressed proactively.

Recommendation F.1.1 – Research opportunities** Strongly encourage departments across the university to post open research positions through the Student Experience platform so that there is an open marketplace for research opportunities; in so doing, identify obstacles that might inhibit faculty from participating.

Recommendation F.1.2 – Global opportunities* Encourage each college (and their respective departments) to identify and address obstacles to participation in international learning opportunities.

Recommendation F.1.3 – Internships* Seek donor support to establish a university-wide internship grant program to make volunteer and low-paying internships financially accessible to students from lower-income backgrounds.

Recommendation F.1.7 – International Students* Enhance efforts within relevant central (e.g., Global Cornell, International Students and Scholars Office, Office of Career Services) and college (e.g., career services, student services, internship programs) units to identify career development and income-generating opportunities for international students, and ensure that they are easy for international students to find.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (F.2): Forces that exacerbate *social* sorting, segregation, status differences and exclusion in students' extracurricular lives need to be examined more carefully, with the goal of counteracting those forces whenever possible.

Recommendation F.2.1a – Greek Life Recruiting* Establish a mechanism that allows students to report experiences of incivility during the recruiting process – particularly those that appear to be motivated by visible social identity characteristics – and include aggregate statistics in the scorecard of Greek chapters.

Recommendation F.2.1b – Physical Spaces in the Greek Community* With renovations to the former house of Psi Upsilon as well as concrete planning for the expansion of university housing underway, communicate a specific plan for allocating physical space for multicultural Greek chapters to live in and/or use for programming. The lack of physical space for historically black fraternities and sororities continues to be felt as a significant source of inequity.

Recommendation F.2.1c – Enhance Transparency About the Cost of Joining Greek Life* Charge each Greek chapter to provide full transparency about their organization's dues prior to the start of recruitment and to lower dues whenever possible.

Recommendation F.2.1d – Provide Financial Assistance to Pay Greek Dues*** Address financial constraints to joining Greek life by establishing a scholarship fund to help offset financial barriers to joining a Greek organization, and charge all Greek chapters to do their part to contribute scholarship funds through fundraising.

Recommendation F.2.2 – Physical Safety* Actively consider ways to respond to student concerns about physical safety.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (F.3): Structures and opportunities that facilitate engagement and integration across boundaries of difference need to be expanded.

Recommendation F.3.1a – Engaged Learning Opportunities in Living/Learning Communities** Offer engaged learning courses to cohorts of students from residential halls.

Recommendation F.3.1b – Engaged Learning Experiences for All Students*** Require that all students participate in some form of community-engaged learning prior to graduation; make this one of the distinctive hallmarks of what it means to be Cornell-educated.

Recommendation F.3.2 – Freshman Housing** Eliminate the option for incoming first-year students to choose their roommates.

Recommendation F.3.3 – Create Multicultural Student Center*** Create a multicultural student center that is designed to preserve (not replace) identity-specific cultural centers while also supporting intersectionality and multicultural programming. Such a center should contain mixed-use spaces that can be used to host social events.

Recommendation F.3.4 – Use of Common Spaces* Engage students in a space study of their residence halls and come up with ideas for how common spaces can be used better or differently so as to facilitate a more welcoming and interactive community.

Recommendation F.3.5 – Intercultural Programming Grants* University-sponsored grants designed explicitly to support collaboration among student organizations (including Greek chapters) in their efforts to offer intercultural programming.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (F.4): Need for more advocacy and investments in physical spaces for identity groups that currently feel under-supported.

Recommendation F.4.1 – Disability Cultural Resource Center** Establish a disability cultural resource center at Cornell, under the leadership of the dean of students.

Recommendation F.4.2 – Executive Disability Steering Committee* Reinvigorate the executive disability steering committee to develop both a short-term plan to advance the university's disability services and advocacy as well as a long-term strategy. Charge the committee with creating clear line of sight for each executive's domain (i.e., the specific actions for which each executive will be responsible).

Recommendation F.4.3 – Religion Advisory Committee* Establish an advisory committee under the leadership of Cornell United Religious Work (CURW) to promote education about religious diversity and provide guidelines to faculty about religious accommodations for students.

Recommendation F.4.4 – Gender-neutral Bathrooms** Designate more bathrooms across campus as gender-neutral bathrooms.

Recommendation F.4.5 – Extra Counseling Support Following Campus Incidents* Offer additional counseling services following campus incidents, perhaps in the form of pop-up counseling support in various locations across campus (including on North and West Campus).

Recommendation F.4.6 – Support for Social Events** Develop a fund to help cover facilities fees for student groups that want to host social events but do not have access to space.

Section G: Support for Student Organizations

Problem/Challenge to be addressed (G.1): The over-proliferation of student organizations goes against students' desire for a more united community.

Recommendation G.1 – Revise Approach to Student Organizations** Re-evaluate and revise the underlying philosophy for student organizations, and clarify the roles and responsibilities of the Student Activities Funding Commission and central administration so that they are complementary and, together, further the university's mission as a land-grant university. Once a new model has been articulated, require student organizations to register anew with the university according to established guidelines about membership, reporting, advising and funding.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (G.2): We do not have a shared understanding of what it means (or should mean) to be a member of a student organization. The current system manages organizations in a transactional way and represent a significant missed opportunity for providing a transformational experience for students. Organizations should provide valuable learning experiences for students.

Recommendation G.2.1 – Student Leadership Development*** Establish a Student Leadership Academy that offers a credit-bearing structured leadership development curriculum for aspiring student leaders.

Recommendation G.2.2 – Advising of Student Organizations** Clarify expectations for advisors of student organizations. To the extent that more stringent expectations are placed on advisors, establish appropriate means for recognizing the service contributions of the faculty and staff involved.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (G.3): Students indicated not feeling sufficiently recognized for their leadership on campus.

Recommendation G.3.1 – Presidential-tier Student Organizations** Establish a "presidential" tier of student organizations for which there would be clear and rigorous requirements for eligibility that would limit the total number of organizations in the tier. Student organizations would need to continue to meet ongoing requirements to maintain their status, but provided they do, the organizations would be eligible for special university-sponsored benefits.

Recommendation G.3.2. – Student Leadership Awards* Develop university-wide student leadership awards to recognize students and student organizations that embody our values and have made visible contributions to promoting an inclusive campus climate.

Recommendation G.3.3. – Mechanisms for Developing Collaborative Solutions*** Sponsor an annual "Grand Student Challenge" hackathon.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (G.4): Although student organizations provide a sense of social belonging for many students, this is not uniformly the case, as some student organizations are seen as a major source of exclusion and/or segregation.

Recommendation G.4.1 – Staff Support for Student Diversity and Action Plans** To provide support to student organizations and to integrate their diversity and inclusion efforts with those of the broader university, we need to deliberately connect their diversity and inclusion plans to the university's overarching TND initiative.

Recommendation G.4.2 – Recruiting Protocols for Selective Student Organizations* Require student organizations that use an application process for admission to abide by "best practice" guidelines for how to manage their recruiting processes. The guidelines should be developed by a group of students, guided by staff from Student and Campus Life.

Section H: Support for Diverse Staff and Faculty

Problem/challenge to be addressed (H.1): The need to lower disproportionately high turnover rates among staff of color and improve our success at increasing staff diversity through hiring (particularly into jobs that are not defined by diversity-specific responsibilities).

Recommendation (H.1.1) – Institutionalize Onboarding Practices* Adopt a more purposeful and attentive approach to onboarding employees who are newly hired into Cornell.

Recommendation (H.1.2) – Involve Employees in Diversity Recruiting* Involve employees in efforts to enhance workforce diversity.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (H.2): Staff who belong to minoritized groups desire a more formal mechanism for being heard and acknowledged by senior leaders in the central administration.

Recommendation H.2.1 – Access to Senior Leaders* Provide opportunities for Colleague Network Groups to interact with senior leaders (e.g., President Pollack, general counsel, VP for student and campus life, provost's staff, VP of human resources) so that staff can feel confident that their needs and concerns are being heard directly (and not filtered through middle layers of management), and their expertise is visible.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (H.3): Staff uniformly expressed a desire for more professional development opportunities.

Recommendation H.3 – Professional Development Fund** Create a central professional development fund to which staff can apply for grants to support their participation in professional development activities (e.g., attend conferences, take courses not available at Cornell).

Problem/challenge to be addressed (H.4): Staff who belong to minoritized groups struggle to find a strong sense of community.

Recommendation H.4.1 – Support Colleague Network Groups* Provide more discretionary funds for the Colleague Network Groups to sponsor events and activities that help connect staff of color professionally and socially.

Recommendation H.4.2 – Ithaca Coalition for Community Diversity*** Launch a partnership – perhaps called the Ithaca Coalition for Community Diversity – with other large employers in Ithaca (e.g., Ithaca College, Ithaca City School District, BorgWarner) to develop shared solutions for developing a vibrant, full-service living community that appeals to diverse populations.

Recommendation H.4.3 – Incentivize Minority-Owned Businesses*** Identify creative incentives that will dramatically increase the number of minority-owned businesses that can thrive in Ithaca and support the diverse community.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (H.5): Because of dramatic increases in the cost of housing within Ithaca over the last decade, staff are increasingly being pushed out of Ithaca into adjacent and less diverse counties. This is negatively impacting quality of life and intentions to stay.

Recommendation H.5 – Housing Task Force* Convene a group to develop a range of possible solutions for improving the availability of housing options for diverse staff.

Committee Membership:

Lisa H. Nishii (Chair), associate professor of human resource studies and vice provost for undergraduate education

Reem Abdalla '20, College of Arts and Sciences

Nicole Agaronnik '19, College of Human Ecology

Brandon Cohen '18, College of Arts and Sciences

Breanne Kisselstein, graduate student, plant pathology and plant-microbe biology

Eugene Law, graduate student, soil and crop sciences

Dustin Liu '19, School of Industrial and Labor Relations

Verónica MartínezMatsuda, assistant professor, School of Industrial and Labor Relations

Peggy Odom-Reed, M.S. '97, Ph.D. '07, senior lecturer, School of Hotel Administration, Cornell SC Johnson College of Business

Alicia O'Neal '18, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences

Neethu Putta '19, Law School

Jolene Rickard, associate professor, College of Arts and Sciences

Erin Sember-Chase, assistant director, Student Disability Services, Student and Campus Life

Trudy Vande Berg, head coach of women's volleyball, Athletics and Physical Education

Reginald White '80, senior management consultant, Organizational Development and Talent Management, Division of Human Resources

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(I) DEFINITION OF INCLUSIVE CLIMATE

The Campus Climate subcommittee was charged with examining the effectiveness of existing structures and resources for promoting an inclusive campus experience, and providing recommendations for improvements that can be made. We began our work by discussing what we collectively interpret the core components of "an inclusive climate experience" to include. The following represent the three common themes that emerged:

1. *Meeting the diverse needs of the community.* This requires first and foremost an awareness among faculty, staff and students that people enter the Cornell community from a wide range of lived experiences, with different levels of readiness for what they will encounter, and with diverse needs and interests associated with their social identities. It also requires that all members of the community be able to easily find answers to questions about who to contact or where to go for what, whether it be for oneself or for others.

2. *Perceived fairness in access to all aspects of the educational and work experiences.* For students, this includes learning and research opportunities, leadership roles, funding, faculty and staff mentoring, and participation and engagement in co- and extracurricular activities. For employees, this includes hiring, promotion and leadership opportunities; access to development and career advancement experiences; and rewards and recognition.

3. *Shared commitment to engaging in meaningful dialogue* to expand our capacity for learning and to enrich the process of scientific inquiry. Our diversity offers tremendous educational value, but only when dialogue and perspective-taking make superadditivity[1] possible. Dialogue is also essential for replacing misunderstandings, judgment and bigotry with humility, respect and curiosity. Dialogue blurs surface-level differences that threaten to divide us and reveals the commonalities that unite us.

The committee's operationalization of inclusive campus climate aligns nicely with the most widely adopted definitions of inclusion in the academic literature. At the individual level, inclusion involves simultaneously experiencing belonging and individuality. Belonging results from a sense of connection or identification with the values and norms that bind community members together: a shared superordinate identity that emerges when the core values of a community are not only very clear but also internalized by community members. Belonging contributes to inclusion only when individuals are also able to maintain and nurture their individuality and feel valued for what they (uniquely) contribute. Inclusion differs from assimilation in which identification with the collective comes at the cost of having one's individuality subsumed by the collective.

---

[1] Superadditivity is when 1 + 1 = 3, under conditions where two unique identities or perspectives are recognized independently and hybrid combinations make the whole greater than the sum of the parts.

Recognizing the diverse needs of community members and striving to meet them (#1 above) rather than expecting community members to conform to monolithic traditions and systems helps to promote individuality. Fairness in access (#2 above) promotes belonging by signaling that each community member has just as much of a right to a full Cornell experience as any other member. A shared commitment to dialogue (#3 above) promotes both belonging and individuality because at the core of dialogue is empathy; demonstrating empathy gives others a feeling of being understood (individuality) and accepted (belonging).

Research on inclusive climate at the collective level also aligns with the committee's operationalization. Inclusive climates are defined as being constituted by three foundational dimensions that mirror the conditions required for positive intergroup interactions: 1) perceived fairness in the implementation of practices and distribution of resources such that arbitrary (i.e., unearned) status hierarchies are delegitimized within the local context; 2) investments in moving beyond simplistic, stereotype-based understandings of others to developing personalized understandings; and 3) interaction norms that facilitate the expression and integration of diverse identities and perspectives, particularly in the pursuit of collective goals.

The academic construct of climate focuses not only on "how things are," which reflect descriptive norms, but also captures shared perceptions about the behaviors that are expected and valued within a particular context (i.e., prescriptive norms). Shaping strong climates involves first *articulating core strategic values* and the associated behaviors that are expected of community members; *role modeling of those behavioral standards* by individuals in key positions of influence; and *reinforcing valued behaviors* by reiterating their importance in many forms, and by rewarding exemplary behaviors and discouraging or punishing unacceptable behaviors. These themes are reflected throughout the recommendations in this report.

(II) SUMMARY OF OUTREACH AND DATA COLLECTION

Document Review

We began our work as a committee by familiarizing ourselves with relevant university reports, dashboards and surveys. We read through available summaries of student, staff and faculty surveys from the last decade. We also combed through the *Toward New Destinations (TND)* goals submitted by units across the university and tried to ascertain which of those goals have been accomplished.

Community Outreach

Our committee members participated in over 200 separate conversations with a wide variety of administrators, faculty, staff, students, alumni and trustees. Meetings ranged in size from one-on-one meetings to groups of up to 100 individuals. We summarized the key ideas from each of these meetings and used this valuable feedback to inform our final recommendations.

Administration and Staff:

We met with numerous administrative leaders and staff from each of the following units and groups (in some cases multiple times over the course of the semester):

- University Diversity Council
- Vice Provosts
- Associate Deans
- Dean and Associate Dean of the Faculty
- Graduate School – Office of the Dean
- University Assemblies
- Student and Campus Life
- Sorority and Fraternity Life
- Campus Activities
- Residential Programs
- Dean of Students
- Student Resource Centers
- Division of Human Resources
- Campus and Community Engagement
- University Counsel
- Office of Inclusion and Workforce Diversity
- University Relations
- Institutional Research and Planning
- Cornell Health, including with Skorton Center Public Health Fellows
- Faculty and Staff Assistance Program (FSAP)
- Bias Assessment and Review Team (BART)
- Title IX Office
- Center for Teaching Innovation
- Office of Engagement Initiatives
- Cornell United Religious Work
- Student Disability Services
- Building a Culture of Respect
- Cornell Interactive Theatre Ensemble
- Office of Academic Diversity Initiatives
- Learning Strategies Center
- Intergroup Dialogue Project
- Student Services Advisors and Leaders
- College Associates
- Counseling and Psychological Services
- Off-Campus, Cooperative, and Graduate Living
- Class Councils
- Athletics

- Latinx Studies Program Staff
- Student-Athlete Advisory Committee
- College Diversity Councils
- Colleague Network Groups (men and women of color, disability, LGBTQ and veterans)
- Residential Hall Directors on North Campus and Assistant Deans on West Campus
- Diversity Community Meeting attendees
- Student Experience Initiative
- Behavioral Health Committee
- First Year Experience Executive Leadership Committee

Faculty:

We met with faculty associated with the University Assembly's Campus Welfare Committee, Diversity Community Meeting, Communidad Latinx in Hospitality, Faculty in Residence on North Campus and House Professor Deans on West Campus, Cornell Coalition for Inclusive Democracy, and Center for the Study of Inequality. We also gathered input at a faculty gathering hosted by the provost and the Office of Faculty Development and Diversity in September of 2017 to discuss campus climate.

Students:

Students with whom we spoke were associated with or represented:

- Student Assembly Academic Policy Committee
- Student Assembly Community Forum
- Student Assembly Diversity and Inclusion Summit
- Student Assembly Executive Board
- Graduate and Professional Student Assembly Diversity and Inclusion Student Committee
- GPSA Town Hall; GPSA Student Advocacy Committee
- Graduate and Professional Student Diversity Council (Black Graduate and Professional Student Association, Latinx Graduate Student Coalition, Cornell Latin American Student Society, Indigenous Graduate Student Association, Society for Asian American Graduate Affairs, Graduate Women in Science, Out in STEM, Multicultural Academic Council)
- Office of Student Engagement Leadership Committee (graduate and professional students)
- Cornell Union for Disability Awareness
- Cornell United Religious Work students
- Multicultural Greek Letter Council
- LGBTQ students
- Residential advisors
- Cayuga's Watchers executive board
- Phi Gamma Nu Fraternity
- Executive board members of the Interfraternity, Panhellenic and MGLC councils

- Consent Ed
- Black Students United
- Faith-based communities
- Law School affinity groups
- Cornell Deaf Awareness Project
- Cornell Chabad
- Mortar Board
- Sphinx Head Society
- ILR Student Government
- leaders of a wide variety of student organizations
- students in Engaged Learning courses
- Athletes

Alumni and trustees:

We participated in discussions with members of the CALS Advisory Council and the Board of Trustees Task Force on Diversity and Campus Climate.

Task Force Survey

All students, academic and nonacademic staff were invited to complete an online survey on March 23, 2018. The survey remained open through April 15, 2018. A total of 2,062 faculty and staff, and 1,164 students (total of 3,226 respondents) completed our online survey. Included in the survey were questions that respondents answered using a numerical scale as well as open-ended questions to which respondents provided written answers. We received a total of 19,447 written comments, which the task force members read to identify major themes.

Benchmarking

When needed, we looked externally for information about how other universities have addressed the issues that our outreach had identified as being important. For example, we examined diversity leadership models, diversity education requirements and alternative approaches to managing student organizations. We also read a handful of equity and inclusion status reports published by peer institutions and spoke with numerous university diversity officers.

(III) **FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE 2018 TASK FORCE**

Section A: Strengthening Community Identification

Overview of what we learned

In our attempts to understand the ways in which violations of our core values contribute to a negative campus climate, it became evident that our core values are not clear. When prompted, most people indicated that "… any person … any study" seems to be a guiding principle and that our land-grant status makes public impact more important for us than is the case for our peer institutions. But when we asked what these core values mean for them in their daily lives, most people were unable to answer the question.

Developing a shared understanding of what it means to be a Cornellian is essential for numerous reasons. Understanding what the collective stands for is a prerequisite for being able to identify with it, and identifying with the whole is a prerequisite for experiencing inclusion within it. As one task force survey respondent described, "*whenever I hear Martha talk about Cornell's mission and vision, I feel like I belong here.*"

A shared understanding of what it means to be a Cornellian also provides an anchor for when we need to highlight things that are not consistent with our values, and helps us to distinguish ourselves from our peers. Furthermore, many people felt that the task force recommendations that are implemented would have greater impact if contextualized within a broader conversation about our core values; doing so would make it less likely for people to feel that they are exempt from the conversation (as can be the case when the focus is more narrowly on diversity). This sentiment is supported by research that suggests that inclusion initiatives are more effective when integrated into the core mission of an organization.

Related to the desire that we strengthen what it means to be Cornell are the many requests that we received for community-building events. People said things like, "*we need more community events that bind rather than divide us*," and "*shared experiences that are built around our core values would help unify community members*." It is absolutely essential that we create a community in which members feel connected and included – the hope is that stronger identification with the collective will help reduce the salience of divisions that exist on campus (e.g., faculty versus staff; undergraduate versus graduate students; domestic versus international students).

Problem/challenge to be addressed (A.1). To renew our collective sense of purpose, the university needs to develop a compact of our core values that can be used as a framework for articulating the behavioral standards we expect of community members and the educational opportunities in which we will focus our investments.

Recommendation A.1 – Core Values Campaign* Launch a core values campaign to ensure that members of our campus community have a clear understanding of the core values that make Cornell distinct.

A Core Values Campaign would help bring to life mottos that have become stale because people can't see how they are embodied in our commitments and investments. The goal would be to answer the following questions: What are our core values? What do those espoused values mean in everyday practice? What are the many ways in which they are operationalized across roles on campus? What do our core values look like in action? How do we own our mission? What are the competencies that we expect all Cornellians – including students, faculty and staff – to develop in support of these core values?

Cornell is bustling with activity and offers a staggering range of opportunities. New members to our community face the challenge of translating loosely coupled activities and ambiguous cues into a pattern of meaning. When left to chance, people's idiosyncratic experiences lead to varied narratives about what Cornell values, and shared "meaning cultures" form among individuals who discuss their experiences and their interpretations of them. Creating strong cultures involves a process of calling attention to certain activities and events, and guiding community members through the process of abstracting meaningful messages from those events. The goal is to make it easy for members of the community to name our core values and describe how they actually manifest in the daily behaviors of students, staff and faculty.

In Appendix 2, we provide recommendations about the key touch points throughout the student and employee life cycles during which our core values can and should be communicated and reinforced.[2] Some alumni and trustees recommended that we create a CORE designation for classes, cross-list courses that meet requirements set forth as part of the core values campaign (e.g., civic engagement; any person … any study; freedom and responsibility; dialogue across difference, etc.), and require all students to take at least two CORE classes. Another noteworthy suggestion is to offer a One Cornell course that provides an overview of the main disciplines represented at Cornell so that students can develop a better understanding of how their chosen discipline fits with others. The course would be enriched by details about activities (past or present) related to the discipline that are distinctly Cornell.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (A.2): Not only does the university need to strengthen our collective identity by clarifying what it means, it also needs to provide more opportunities for people to have a shared experience, particularly through community-wide events.

---

[2] The advisory council members and trustees with whom we spoke suggested that we need to remember to "re-educate" alumni about our core values and, in particular, the different ways in which they manifest now compared to when they may have been students.

The second most common theme that emerged in response to a task force survey question that prompted people to describe a time when they experienced a positive sense of belonging or inclusion at Cornell had to do with people's experiences of "One Cornell" at community-wide events. Illustrative comments include the following:

- *"I often help at Slope Day which is always fun. The teamwork is inspiring. I helped out at a private event with Joe Biden last year, and that was fantastic too!"*
- *"The inauguration of President Pollack was especially meaningful for me, from the ceremony itself to the fair afterward. I worked on my school's booth, reconnected with staff, faculty, and students that I had not seen in a long time, and got a chance to see what other schools are working on."*

Interestingly, Black/African American and Hispanic survey respondents were proportionately more likely to reference community-wide events as a source of belonging for them, pointing to the importance of these experiences for promoting inclusion.

Recommendation A.2. – Inclusive community events* Sponsor more events that are open to the entire community, ideally ones that celebrate what is distinctive about Cornell.

Our outreach surfaced many ideas for themed community festivals. Examples include a convocation at the beginning of the academic year in which we collectively renew our compact of core values, much like white coat ceremonies in medical schools; a festival that highlights the individuals and groups that have a positive impact on our community and the world beyond; an annual celebration of Cornell's birthday (April 27th); a day for showcasing the diversity of our community; and Veterans Day. Many individuals fondly recalled the informal and inclusive feel that the diversity of food trucks lent to President Pollack's inauguration and lobbied for more events featuring food trucks. One group suggested the value in featuring Cornell statement cards created by students, faculty and staff ("At Cornell, we stand for … .") at such an event.

Events do not necessarily have to be expansive, university-wide festivals to be meaningful or promote a sense of community. In their written responses to the task force survey, faculty and staff described smaller events to which they were invited to bring their families as facilitating a sense of belonging. Others expressed appreciation for events like the Veterinary College's Open House, "Bring a Child to Work Day," "Splash" and, more recently, the pop-up bar at Willard Straight and "Project Eddy Gate."

Section B: The Organizing Structure for the University's Diversity and Inclusion Goals

Overview of what we learned

Although Cornell's investment in diversity and inclusion is comparable to – or even greater than – that of our peer institutions, our decentralized structure has overall hindered rather than catalyzed progress at the university level. We repeatedly came across evidence of how the

many decentralized initiatives across the university fail to add up in a significant way, in part because they often operate in total isolation. Another reason is because of the "mom and pop" approach that is used in some units that are "winging it," sometimes without professional expertise or clear guiding principles. Although some units have adopted visible and innovative practices, in the absence of a strong central "engine" for diversity and inclusion, the community has not experienced a singular culture or vision. Individuals are often unclear about whom to turn or where to go for what, and units have tended to engage in knowledge sharing only on an ad hoc and limited basis.

When the University Diversity Council (UDC; see Appendix 3) was formed, the intention was for it to serve as the nexus of the university's diversity and inclusion efforts. In many respects, the university diversity officers (UDOs) have done an excellent job in leading diversity and inclusion efforts for their respective populations. However, they have an extremely limited budget and no dedicated staff for developing, communicating and implementing an institutional-level strategic plan. As one UDO aptly phrased it, "we need a conductor for the orchestra"; without one, visible impact is much less likely to emerge at the institutional level. Systematic change is virtually impossible within the existing structure because only very limited resources are dedicated to coordinating goal setting, analyzing and sharing data to serve as inputs for goal setting, assessing the impact of initiatives, and monitoring progress across the university.

With the leadership of the UDC, the perceived importance of the Toward New Destination (TND) goal-setting process has increased over the last few years, and units have become accustomed to setting annual goals. To date, the approach has been to ask these units to develop annual goals related to the four core TND principles of composition, achievement, engagement and inclusion (see Appendix 4), and then provide a narrative account of progress to the UDC at the end of the year. The localized, bottom-up approach has allowed innovative approaches to develop in some units, and central review of TND goals by the UDOs has also helped the university to identify those practices that other units can emulate. However, without clear accountability mechanisms, the TND process is seen by many as a loosely coupled pro forma activity that lacks "real teeth."

If TND continues to serve as the guiding framework for diversity goal setting in the colleges and large administrative units, the university needs to enhance accountability for goal attainment, be more data-driven, involve more faculty and staff in the process, and expand the reach and impact of the TND initiative by cascading it down to lower-level departments. Establishing clear accountability requires close oversight of the goals that are set and the tactics that are employed to meet those goals. It also requires assessment of the impact of those tactics and, ultimately, an authority *to whom* units are accountable, with clarity about *what* they are accountable for (e.g., good faith efforts, or measurable progress within a defined timeframe?)

and with what consequences. It seems due time to take the TND process from its nascent phase and make the commitments and investments needed to drastically improve its potential.[3]

Each of these concerns is addressed in the problem statements and associated recommendations below.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (B1): Despite the substantial investments made in diversity and inclusion across campus, decentralization and fragmentation inhibit impact and visibility. The university has an urgent need for more intentional connectivity and collaboration across units that do not depend on the goodwill of the UDOs to do extra work in their "spare time."

Recommendation B1.1 – Dedicated Professional Staff to Unify Decentralized Efforts*

Create a new professional staff position for someone whose sole responsibility would be to oversee the revision and expansion of the TND initiative.

This individual needs a strong data analytics background combined with extensive work experience related to diversity and inclusion. This individual would serve as the central node for best-practice sharing, pushing needed data out to units to inform goal setting, disseminating information about recommended resources for pursuing TND goals and standardized tools for assessing impact, and ensuring that the TND goals that are set and accomplished are communicated[4] more broadly with the university community. This individual would work in close collaboration with, and under the guidance of, the UDC.

Alignment across segments of our large university population could be further enhanced by having this central TND officer provide direct support to student groups that have recently sought to implement their own diversity and inclusion plans (e.g., the top four tiers of student organizations; Greek chapters). From what we learned in our outreach, Resolution 79 of the Student Assembly – according to which student organizations are expected to submit diversity and inclusion plans to the vice president of diversity and inclusion for the Student Assembly – has failed in its implementation because student leaders lack the expertise needed to evaluate the plans, provide input and monitor progress against stated goals. A designated TND officer could provide the expertise and guidance needed to help student organizations follow through on their great intentions.

---

[3] A good place to start may be to replace the TND moniker with a label that is more instinctively recognizable, such as Diversity and Inclusion Action Plans.

[4] Note our recommendation in Section C is also to hire a communications professional with expertise related to diversity and inclusion to do the following: develop and manage communication protocols (including communication in response to campus incidents); manage a full-service platform through which people can easily find answers, resources and communities; and disseminate news and stories in more effective ways.

Recommendation B.1.2 – Increase Discretionary Funds for the UDC* Increase discretionary funds to support university-level activities that do not squarely fall within the domain of any one UDO, and to equip the UDC with the needed agility to respond to community needs as they emerge.

Recommendation B1.3 – Guide TND with Institutional-level Goals* Identify a limited number of specific, measurable institutional-level goals each year (or over another defined timeframe), to which units should link local efforts.

To date, the TND process has not been guided by a university-level strategy. Instead, strong centrifugal forces have pulled people and resources away from a cohesive whole.

By identifying a set of goals (based on data) as priorities for the university and aligning all units to those goals, we will vastly improve the odds of making visible progress. Of course, units may set additional goals that are specific to their local communities.

One mechanism for augmenting the energy and momentum that is generated around institutional goals could be to appoint research fellows with expertise associated with each goal or theme. With appropriate incentives in place (e.g., research funds; course buy-out), fellows could play an active role in providing direction and inspiration to TND units by sharing relevant research-based knowledge and benchmarking data, organizing seminars with guest speakers, and convening discussion forums for TND unit leaders related to the theme or goal.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (B2): There is a need for well-understood accountability mechanisms as well as channels for voice and communication to the president and provost about campus climate and diversity issues.

Currently, it is unclear who "owns" our diversity and inclusion goals. This includes questions about *who* is accountable for what but also *to whom* they are accountable. A related question has to do with whether those individuals who are seen as having responsibility for diversity and inclusion have the power and resources to make things happen.

Recommendation B.2.1 – UDC Connection to both President and Provost* Within the existing UDC structure, designate a chair at both the UDO and executive levels. Have the executive chair represent diversity and inclusion issues in both the president's cabinet and provost's staff meetings.

Because the UDC does not have one executive who is tasked with serving as the voice for the UDC (and the university's diversity and inclusion issues more broadly) to *both* the president and provost, diffusion of responsibility and decentralization limit

accountability and impact.[5] Having a single individual participate regularly in both sets of senior leadership meetings would provide reliable channels for both top-down strategic input and bottom-up voice, and would enhance coordination between the "two sides of the house." The executive chair should be a tenured faculty member and should ideally attend all UDO meetings to maintain constant access to information.

With these changes, the UDC should consider whether any groups exist that are not part of TND units and, therefore, may lack formal voice to senior leaders through the TND framework. Examples include student groups (mentioned in B.1.1) and Colleague Network Groups.

Recommendation B.2.2 – College-level Leadership*** Faculty in positions of influence should be formally integrated into the diversity leadership structure within each college.

Of the 49 individuals with job titles that are explicitly related to diversity, three of them (6 percent) are tenured faculty members. This is a limitation, for as one person put it, "*Diversity to the academy is like paint to a house. The appearance changes, but the structure stays the same. Diversity and inclusion are not embedded in higher education. Until we embed it in our research and teaching mission, it will be window dressing.*" In other words, those who are responsible for diversity work need to be connected to the core mission by virtue of their position of influence.

People agree that a key to the widely visible diversity successes of the College of Engineering is having a senior associate dean to lead the faculty in enacting needed changes. Similarly assigning a senior faculty administrator in each college to spearhead diversity efforts and liaise with both the UDC and with counterparts in the other colleges (e.g., by forming an Academic Diversity Council) would affirm the university's commitment to diversity and inclusion, and create a more effective leadership structure for implementing the recommendations contained in this report.

Recommendation B.2.3 – Communication of TND Goals* Require units to communicate their TND goals with their constituent members (e.g., on college website, with students, staff, faculty and alumni).

The motivations for this recommendation are twofold: to enhance visibility of TND efforts and to encourage even greater mindfulness about the goals that units develop. Our expectation is that with more eyes on the TND goals of a particular college or unit, the greater the chance that people will want to engage in dialogue about those goals, ask questions and provide input (e.g., why is X seen as a priority but not Y?). Furthermore, because the members of each TND unit represent the intended audience

---

[5] The UDOs explained that although the UDC executives have been very supportive, it historically has not been part of their role to be experts in D&I or officially represent the UDC in both the president's cabinet and provost's staff meetings. Currently, each executive participates in one or the other set of senior leadership meetings but not both.

and beneficiaries of the TND goals, more public visibility will serve as a powerful form of accountability.

Recommendation B.2.4 – Student Advisory Board to the UDC** Create a Student Advisory Board to the UDC to serve as a formal mechanism through which students can discuss ongoing diversity and inclusion issues with senior administrators.

An element of our subcommittee's charge was to consider ongoing mechanisms for addressing diversity and inclusion issues. Students with whom we spoke felt strongly that there be an alternative to existing approaches for voicing diversity and inclusion issues to senior administrators. They expressed concern that some of the approaches currently used to voice frustrations – including passing resolutions in the student assemblies, delivering a list of demands, and publishing articles in The Cornell Daily Sun – are not always conducive to productive dialogue about root problems and possible solutions. Students requested that these advisory board positions be established as paid roles to ensure that income is not a barrier to participation.

Recommendation B.1.1: Student Advisory Board or paid RA positions to ensure open communication channels. (Brown has Student Advisory Board)

Problem/challenge to be addressed (B3): Diversity and inclusion are not sufficiently integrated with the core research and teaching mission of the university.

Although integrating more senior faculty administrators across the colleges in accountability structures (as recommended in B.2.2) is essential, the TND initiative is likely to remain invisible to students until it is more fully integrated with the research and teaching mission of the organization.

Recommendation B.3 – Department-level TND Goals** Push the TND process down to the level of academic department[6] so that diversity goal setting is directly linked to our educational mission.

An early lesson we learned in our outreach was that the TND initiative is not felt in the classroom; students are completely unaware of it, as are most staff and faculty. It continues to be the case that many faculty do not think that diversity and inclusion are related to their academic work or relevant for the courses they teach – that is, of course, unless there is a direct connection to their expertise.

---

[6] Also push goal-setting down to the sub-unit level in large administrative units (e.g., Career Services, Cornell Health, Athletics, Campus and Community Engagement within Student and Campus Life) so that TND is authentically integrated in staff communities.

The intent underlying this recommendation is to have academic departments reflect critically about issues related not only to considering access and composition but also to closing achievement gaps; diversifying curricular content (i.e., embedding a diversity of perspectives and epistemologies, and considering how scientific principles or their application may be culturally bounded); building community; ensuring decision-making transparency; and setting goals that will help modernize our approach to diversity and inclusion as a premier institution of higher education.

Related to curricular issues, in our outreach we heard numerous examples of what it could look like to have academic departments diversify their curricular content. Within plant sciences, this might involve seeking to understand plants not only scientifically but also culturally. Within Architecture, Art and Planning (AA&P), it might mean ensuring that non-Western art is covered sufficiently in introductory courses. There is already a course called "Hidden Voices in Science" that is based on the premise that science and engineering cannot be fully understood without an awareness of how scientific knowledge has been generated and influenced both by those that have historically had the privilege to participate and those who have been marginalized and have not received as much attention.[7]

A number of excellent examples also show how attention at the level of the academic department to pedagogical strategies can have an enormous positive impact on learning outcomes. The introduction of active learning pedagogies within some Arts and Sciences departments, for example, has enhanced learning outcomes, inclusion and well-being.

We recommend beginning with a pilot in a college that is already highly committed to diversity (perhaps Engineering or CALS) so that guidelines and examples can be shared to facilitate implementation in other colleges. We expect that a pilot would also help identify the pieces of data that academic departments may need to identify their strengths and weaknesses when it comes to diversity and inclusion. These insights would help inform efforts related to the next challenge, which has to do with the underutilization of data in goal setting.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (B4): Despite the fact that the university has developed a diversity dashboard that contains a wide range of useful information (and for which it is widely regarded as a leader among peer institutions), the data are underutilized, in part because few people are aware of its existence and know how to access it.

More generally, our outreach revealed that diversity-related goals are commonly set based on hunches and anecdotal evidence than on reliable metrics. In the famous words of Peter Drucker, this is problematic because "if you can't measure it, you can't improve it," by

---

[7] Course description: Everyone knows Darwin, Newton, and Einstein, but what about Percy Julian, Barbara McClintock, and Carlos Finlay? This course will expose students to the female and minority scientists who made significant contributions to their fields but are largely unknown.

which he meant that it is only when metrics are collected and tracked that people can know whether or not they are making any progress on outcomes of interest.

Recommendation B.4.1 – Push Diversity Scorecard Data to Units * Collect, analyze and disseminate diversity analytics to TND units for use in developing goals and monitoring progress against those goals.

A key element of this recommendation is for scorecard metrics to be pushed out to the colleges each year in the form of an annual report on key diversity indicators. That way, the system is not dependent on having unit leaders know about the dashboard seeking out the information. This type of approach is common among companies known to be "highly engaged" – they share survey results and other data with line managers and hold them accountable for openly discussing the results with their employees and collectively developing action plans as a unit.

Recommendation B.4.2 – Revise the Diversity Scorecard * Establish a Diversity Assessment Advisory Group consisting of faculty and professional staff to evaluate and revise the components and construct definitions included in the diversity scorecard.

Given our access as a top research institution to scholars with highly relevant expertise, we recommend convening a Diversity Assessment Advisory Group to help assess and revise the diversity scorecard. We recommend a careful evaluation of the component dimensions, associated metrics and construct definitions. We saw some evidence, for example, that the distinction between the engagement and inclusion TND principles may be blurred by overlapping construct definitions.

Section C: Raising Awareness Through Better Communication

Overview of what we learned

People often do not know about available resources or don't know where to find them. This is likely because of several reasons: a) information is difficult to find on the Cornell website (and in many cases is not up-to-date); b) too many units send emails in an uncoordinated way; and c) email may not be the most effective way to reach community members. Unfortunately, in the absence of readily available information, some people are quick to assume that the university "doesn't care," "is not transparent" and/or "isn't doing anything."

We learned through our conversations with Cornell Health's Skorton Center for Health Initiatives staff, Public Health Fellows, CAPS counselors and student advisors that challenges associated with finding community and needed resources also exacerbate feelings of loneliness among students. It can take a while for students to adjust to their new environment, make meaningful friendships and figure out how to find micro-communities where they feel they belong. When they look around and see other students who appear to be involved and have friends, it's difficult for them not to feel like the outlier when, in fact, we know from research

that these feelings are much more common than they are visible. Nevertheless, students expressed a desire for an up-to-date and searchable source of information about our vibrant community.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (C.1): Community members have trouble finding information about available resources and initiatives.

A recurring lesson from our outreach was that Cornell's large and decentralized structure has resulted in a plethora of units (and websites) that address a set of issues. As a result, students, staff and faculty are reliably unsure about how to find definitive answers to their questions and/or remain unaware of a significant proportion of ongoing activities that are relevant to their interests. For example, when we followed up on students' comments about how students bear the brunt of diversity and inclusion work, and/or that they perceive the administration not to be taking action, we often saw that part of the problem was that existing resources and efforts were simply not visible to students. In conversations with staff from the Office of Community and Campus Engagement and from Cornell Health, we learned that although students may be aware that many resources exist, they are easily overwhelmed by the sheer volume of available resources.

After repeatedly hearing in our outreach about people's frustrations in finding what they need and/or learning about the many units and initiatives that may be of interest to them, we decided to gauge the pervasiveness of the problem by including a set of questions in the task force survey about undergraduate students' awareness of (and likelihood of using) a wide range of resources. We found that while half to three-quarters of students are aware of who or where to turn for academic and career-related support, their awareness of resources for meeting personal and social needs is lower (see Tables 1a-1d). Particularly troublesome is the fact that only about a third of students know how to report bias incidents or to whom they can turn to talk about experiences of exclusion (only 28 percent).

When information and resources are difficult to find, the system privileges those students and employees who are better able to navigate it – whether it be due to their social networks, role models and mentors, or savvy parents – thereby exacerbating inequities. Indeed, first-generation, racial/ethnic minority and low-income students are even less likely to be aware of how to find support for pursuing research with faculty, identifying and preparing for career options, finding summer opportunities, and addressing experiences of bias. This problem was captured succinctly by a faculty member who wrote, "*It might seem like we have access to lots of opportunities, but the likelihood of a student actually being able to get and pursue the opportunity is not equal. I think a lot of it has to do with knowledge and understanding of how the systems work and where to find and use resources.*"

More specific examples of the challenges that students face in accessing what they need are evident in students' written responses to the task force survey:

- *"Research opportunities are often hidden and not put out in the open for everyone."*
- *"Students are not notified of how to apply for an RA position clearly, and I missed the deadline because of that. A similar story goes for on-campus employment. Students just aren't notified equitably about the resources that are available to them."*
- *"As a professional student, I really don't know what resources are available to me outside of my immediate school/program. I'd love to be a part of the greater Cornell community, but I wouldn't even know where to start."*
- *"I don't know how to contact, engage and get information about available resources and opportunities. Is there a central repository for such information?"*

Faculty responses to the task force survey echoed what we learned from students:

- *"Students can have mental health issues, need help with learning disabilities, feel isolated and lonely, discriminated against, unsafe, angry, etc. They often come to faculty for help and advice. We in turn need to know where to turn. It would be really helpful to have one email or phone number that you can call – like a 911 number that could then transfer the call or email to the appropriate resource. This could be for students, staff and faculty. At the moment, there are multiple different places you have to call. It's hard to remember who you need to contact. If that were possible it would make it easier to report incidents and to help students, staff or faculty who are in distress."*
- *"A better developed resource page covering each of these topics would be *very* helpful."*
- *"We need a flow chart of how to respond if x happens, contact this office/person/resource, for example, prioritizing and clarifying those things that require urgent responses and a protocol for follow-up."*

The challenge that people experience in accessing needed information is problematic because it impacts stress and well-being, and also thwarts collaboration. Attendees at the Student Assembly's Diversity and Inclusion Summit, for example, described how coalition building across student organizations is difficult because it's impossible to find other students organizations that may have a shared mission.

Recommendation C.1.1 – Central Portal and App for Finding Resources* Prioritize the development of a "Find Your Resource" platform that is comprehensive, easy to navigate and searchable, ideally with an accompanying mobile app version.

The key to this platform's success will be socializing all community members (as well as job and student applicants) to think of this platform as their one-stop shop for accessing information about resources.[8] The platform could be organized in a number of different

---

[8] The use of the Sales Force CRM for facilitating student access to learning opportunities ("Find Your Experience") makes Sales Force a particularly attractive platform for this initiative. Its attractiveness is further enhanced by the

ways, for example, with separate "tiles" for undergraduate, graduate/professional, staff and faculty. Embedded within each of them would be subsections such as "find community," "get help," "report bias," "develop your skills," "maintain your health and well-being," "explore residential living and dining," "access centers of excellence," etc., each with search filters that help users to more easily find the information they need.

Recommendation C.1.2 – Dynamic Messaging** Push news and stories out to the community.

A related and recurring theme that emerged from our outreach is that we have not done a good job communicating our many successes related to diversity and inclusion; whether or not someone knows about the community-building opportunities, networking lunches, speaker series, dialogue opportunities, cutting-edge programs, etc., depends on the networks they happen to be plugged into. At a time when people are attuned to negative campus incidents, the lack of a strong communication presence means that all the good that is happening is being eclipsed by the negative. Then, when we attempt to describe all that we have (and have had) in our communications following an incident, it comes across as reactive and less authentic.

Community members would like to hear people's stories and would like to be better informed about campus news and events, ideally well in advance, and the mobile app recommended in C.1.1. also could address this need. Numerous people suggested that we create a calendar of events. The challenge, of course, would be in deciding what types of events are included. Others suggested that we push stories and news out to the community because otherwise they remain buried on the Cornell website, largely invisible to those who do not know what to look for.[9] Finally, a common critique was our continued reliance on email as the primary mechanism for communicating with students. We were repeatedly reminded that email is one of the least effective ways of capturing the attention of students. The mobile app would allow Cornell to easily communicate information, such as news update, events, and helpful resources during emergency and nonemergency situations, with real-time status updates.

Whatever the strategy that is ultimately adopted, effective implementation would likely require a communication staff person who is dedicated to content related to diversity and inclusion, broadly defined. At the moment, communication efforts are dependent

---

capacity to link with other data management systems. Examples of apps include Harvard's mobile app or Thrive@Harvard.app, Yale's mobile app and Princeton's mobile app.

[9] The "Monday Morning Message" sent out by the Dean of Faculty is a great example of a pithy weekly message that contains 3-5 important news and reminder items. An example of a more comprehensive version is Ithaca College's daily "Intercom Roundup" that contains hyperlinks to top stories, news, and announcements under the following categories: top stories; news and notices; lectures and presentations; learning opportunities; kudos; news for faculty, for staff, and for students; student organizations; HR news; community connections.

on the goodwill of staff members to do it in their "spare time." The individual assigned to this role would need to be well-versed in diversity and inclusion issues.

Recommendation C.1.3 – Social Media* Utilize social media channels to communicate with students in an effort to reduce response times and be more nimble.

Many community members perceive communications from the administration as a bureaucratic exercise. For understandable reasons, the university tends to be very careful about verifying facts and having multiple units approve the details of a message before sending it out to the community. There are two unfortunate byproducts of this tendency: in the meantime community members rely on sometimes incomplete or inaccurate information from other sources; and readers describe the messages as feeling "over-crafted" and "lacking an authentic, human touch." People described the central administration as "looking so out of touch and un-transparent."

Many different groups we spoke with recommended that we try to address senior leaders' risk aversion and hesitation to use social media so that we can be more nimble in our responses. Brief updates to the community (such as, "there are conflicting accounts of the reported incident; details are being investigated") can in fact buy the university more time to vet the facts and identify communication constraints while also closing the perceived distance between the administration and community members.

Ultimately, the hope is that a mobile app will address these concerns. In the interim – while it is being developed – the administration should evaluate and select an alternative to employ.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (C.2): Awareness of, and likelihood of using, available resources for addressing bias incidents is especially low, as is the utilization of information collected to inform future actions.

Survey results showed that not only is student awareness of available resources for addressing bias incidents low, but also they indicated a lower likelihood to use such resources (mean scores of 2.63 – 2.79 on a scale of 1-5 where 2 = unlikely and 3 = somewhat likely). This is obviously problematic because the first critical step to being able to take action against bias is to report it. It is much harder for the university to investigate bias incidents, take action and support students who experience harm if students have not shared the information necessary to do so.

Furthermore, our outreach conversations with a wide variety of community members, as well as with the staff members responsible for managing the bias reporting system, revealed that there appears to be a lot of misunderstanding about who – the CUPD, Judicial Administrator, Dean of Students' Office, Bias Assessment Review Team – investigates claims

and under what circumstances (e.g., how it is reported and the nature of the incident), the conditions under which an investigation is even possible, and the factors that determine what responses are appropriate. Many community members are also unaware of the legal constraints that often make it impossible to disclose information about a case to the public. At a time when students remark that the university's response to bias is sometimes too weak, it is imperative that several changes be made immediately.

Finally, we learned that aggregate information about reported incidents is not being utilized as it could. Enhancing learning from reported bias incidents would involve three critical steps: (1) collecting and collating relevant data from different sources; (2) analyzing available data and present findings in easily interpretable forms; and (3) sharing lessons learned with members of the community (ideally by pushing the data out rather than relying on people to seek it).

Recommendation C.2.1 – Education About Bias Reporting* Increase awareness about what constitutes bias and prohibited conduct, including how to report it, and the specific factors that influence the sequence of steps that follow.

Given heightened sensitivity to bias, developing a dynamic and easy-to-understand video-based illustration of a process that is more complex than most people understand would be well worth the investment. [10] The video should explain how bias reporting is handled, including the types of details that can be shared and those that cannot (i.e., due to privacy laws), the person or office that evaluates incidents, and the consequences for different forms of misconduct.

Recommendation C.2.2 – Revisions to Bias Reporting System* Conduct a careful review of the Maxient form that is used to collect information about a specific incident and make revisions that will improve the quality of reporting that is possible.

Revisions to the online system for reporting bias incidents should include the provision of clear information for the claimant about the steps that will follow the submission of the report.

Recommendation C.2.3 – Responses to Bias Incidents* Develop clear guidelines for the review team about appropriate responses, including who should be informed about what types of incidents.

Our outreach revealed uncertainty about when, for example, the supervisor, chair or academic dean of an alleged perpetrator should be informed. Similarly, complainants often request that the alleged perpetrator not be informed about the report, mainly due to concerns about retaliation or harming the person's career. It is their prerogative to do

---

[10] Options include creating a [whiteboard animation video](#) or an animated story board like the famous "I'm Just a Bill" from Schoolhouse Rock, renamed "I am an incident."

so. However, if multiple complaints are filed against a single individual, can – and should – the response team go against the wishes of the complainant and communicate the pattern of bias to the appropriate supervisor?

Recommendation C.2.4 – Develop a Plan for Sharing Aggregate Data About Bias* Develop a task force to work through reporting and legal details associated with publishing available information about bias incidents and sexual misconduct.

This would entail developing a protocol and mechanisms for extracting, synthesizing and disseminating critical data and lessons learned from incidents that are reported to the Bias Reporting System, Judicial Administrator, Cornell University Police and the Title IX office. The trends and patterns that emerge would be used to inform education efforts, evaluate the need to revise existing structures and resources, and address student concerns about the lack of transparency involved in these systems. The data should also be used to create a map of "hot spot" locations based on the number of reported bias incidents associated with any location (and perhaps also an indication of high-risk times during the academic year) so that students can make informed decisions about where to (or not to) socialize.

Section D: Diversity Education

A major weakness in the university's existing approach to diversity education is that it is fractured and inconsistent. Some students opt to take courses related to diversity and inclusion if they are interested, others do not. Some units elect to offer some type of programming for their faculty, staff and/or students, while others do not. Some units outsource their training to established training providers and facilitators on campus (e.g., IDP, Cornell Interactive Theatre Ensemble, Cornell Center for Teaching Innovation, Inclusive Excellence Academy), while others rely on volunteers. Furthermore, there are many providers of diversity education on campus, some of which serve overlapping segments of the university population (e.g., faculty and staff) without any direct coordination. Despite the best of intentions, the highly decentralized approach undermines the potential for training to have a positive impact on campus climate.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (D.1): Existing providers of diversity education on campus operate in isolation without a coordinated strategy.

There are numerous lost opportunities and even unintended negative consequences of an uncoordinated approach to diversity education. At the most basic level, there is the risk that the propagation of different frameworks and terminology weakens the perceived legitimacy of diversity education efforts (particularly among skeptics), and limits the possibility of establishing a strong culture in support of equity and inclusion.

Decades of research on training effectiveness has documented that even if people acquire new knowledge or skills during training, they are unlikely to actually apply what they have learned in their post-training lives unless what they have learned is continually reinforced.

Members of the community cannot reinforce critical knowledge and skills for each other unless they hold them in common. Furthermore, the impact of shared frameworks is amplified when people are aware that they are shared, as this realization removes psychological barriers to utilizing new insights.

Another cost of the fragmented approach is that it is currently impossible to know which segments of our university population have participated in diversity education, about what and when, and therefore it is also difficult to assess whether upskilling would be beneficial. Finally, it is not possible to integrate the university's approach to diversity education with other components of the university's strategy for promoting diversity and inclusion if people lack a shared understanding of what that approach is.

Recommendation D.1 – Umbrella Structure for Diversity Education** Establish an
umbrella structure (e.g., "Inclusive Leadership Academy @ Cornell") for diversity
education across the university, with the goal of reducing uncoordinated redundancy
and instead enabling a synergistic collaborative approach.

The ideal is to develop a holistic strategy that takes into account the specific needs of each segment of our university population, including the best mode and timing of training delivery, and desired strategies for reinforcing what is learned through training so that it is actually retained and utilized by trainees. The diversity education that people actually receive can then be compared against the meta-strategy to identify gaps and formulate a plan for how to improve impact by coordinating across training providers[11] to fill those gaps.

This umbrella structure would also serve as the one-stop shop to which units on campus can turn when in need of training to minimize the chances that units attempt to develop and deliver their own content because they are uncertain what university resources are available. For example, we learned through our outreach that when diversity training for student leaders of Greek life and for new members was mandated for the first time this spring, the training was rolled out as two separate initiatives, managed by different people. This is unfortunate because despite the best of intentions, what leaders learned did not align with what new members learned, thereby diluting overall impact. We also heard that in the absence of unified leadership and messaging surrounding the training for leaders versus new members, students were confused about what was expected of them. With a centralized structure in place, it would become possible to align the strategies, content and timing of diversity education such that community members

---

[11] There are a wide variety of diversity providers on campus, including the Inclusive Excellence Academy (embedded in HR), the Faculty Institute for Diversity, Cornell Health, Cornell Interactive Theatre Ensemble (embedded in HR), the Graduate School, Office of Faculty Development and Diversity, the Office of the Dean of Students, and Intergroup Dialogue Project (IDP). In addition to the courses and workshops delivered by these units, it is not uncommon for individual colleges and units to develop their own content.

receive a clear message about the behaviors that are expected and valued by the university and why.

Additional benefits of investing in a coordinated structure include the increased likelihood that impact is amplified through reinforcement[12]; leaders can provide support for a unified strategy; and experts ensure that the diversity training that is offered leverages accumulated wisdom from research. For example, research has established that diversity training is more effective when it focuses not just on awareness building but also the development of behavioral skills, and is interactive (vs. one-way delivery of information), longer in duration (i.e., overall hours of training) and supported by leaders.

Indeed, research supports the idea that exposure to multiple, coordinated training episodes is more effective than one-off, standalone approaches. The compounding benefits emerge not only because repeated exposure facilitates practice and protects against learning decay, but also because it signals leadership commitment to diversity and inclusion far beyond what can be communicated by offering a single course or workshop.

Another important byproduct of longer training programs is that participants benefit from the opportunity to develop lasting relationships with their co-participants. A large proportion of staff respondents to the task force survey mentioned that participation in training programs such as "Turning Point," which is a five-day leadership program, engendered a sense of belonging for them.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (D.2): When individuals in positions of authority do not visibly support community members' participation in diversity training, it generates resentment and confusion, and weakens messages about the value of diversity and inclusion to the university.

When leaders do not actively support individuals' participation in diversity training, it is much more likely for individuals to interpret the institution's espoused messages about the importance of diversity and inclusion as mere window dressing. We heard examples of this in our outreach, for example when a supervisor tells a staff member that the training "doesn't apply to you so you need to stay at your desk," or coaches express discontent when athletes have to miss practice to attend training. In contrast, when diversity training is "blessed by higher authority," individuals are more motivated to learn.

This likely explains why a recent meta-analysis of diversity training effectiveness involving 260 independent samples – which was co-authored by Jamie Perry, a Cornell researcher –

---

[12] For a recent Time article on the limited impact of standalone diversity training, see: http://time.com/5287082/corporate-diversity-training-starbucks-results/

showed that mandatory training is more effective.[13] Although it is true that people prefer to have a choice over whether to participate in diversity training, voluntary training does not yield the strongest effects on learning and behavioral change, particularly since it means that we continue to preach to the choir – faculty, staff and students who are intrinsically motivated to advance diversity and inclusion are the ones who participate in seminars, workshops and other educational opportunities. What this suggests is that the university should be bold in requiring diversity education.

> **Recommendation D.2 – Visible Leader Support for Diversity Education*** Ensure that there is visible top-down support for diversity education, beginning with the president and cascading down through all levels of leadership.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (D.3). Despite the fact that we can reliably predict that every student will continue to face diversity in their workplaces and communities throughout their lives, Cornell hast not yet committed to providing all students with at least some minimum level of preparation for engaging effectively with a diverse world.

Currently, only the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences (CALS) has a contemporary diversity course requirement with clear guidelines that restrict the types of courses that will satisfy the requirement.[14] Although the College of Arts and Sciences (A&S) and the ILR School have a "cultural analysis" and "cultural perspectives" distribution requirement, respectively, that could be satisfied by diversity courses, it can also be satisfied by a broad range of other courses that would not necessarily prepare students to engage and lead effectively in a diverse society. Our benchmarking suggests that many of our peer institutions (Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Princeton, Brown, Dartmouth, UCLA, U. Washington) have adopted an approach that appears similar to that at A&S and ILR – they have broad distribution requirements rather than more specific diversity requirement. We encourage Cornell to similarly respond to the intense challenges and opportunities presented by our diverse world by introducing a university-wide diversity course requirement.

---

[13] Bezrukova, Spell, Perry, & Jehn (2016). A meta-analytical integration of over 40 years of diversity training evaluation. *Psychological Bulletin, 142(11):* 1227-1274.

[14] The CALS Human Diversity Requirement: "It is expected that in the process of earning a degree, students will enhance their abilities to communicate with people of different cultural perspectives; to listen carefully and respectfully to views of others, especially views with which they disagree; and to employ ethical reasoning in judging ideas, actions, and their implications. These courses explore the challenges of building a diverse society, and/or examine the various processes that marginalize people and produce unequal power relations in terms of race, nationality, ethnicity, sexuality, religion, gender, age, or economic status. All courses that satisfy the Human Diversity requirement have at least 50% content in one of the following areas: (a) critical analysis of historically or contemporary marginalized* communities; (b) examination of diverse processes that produce unequal power relations in terms of race, nationality, ethnicity, sexuality, religion, gender, age, or economic status; or (c) review of the challenges of building a diverse society."

Recommendation D.3 – Institute a Diversity Course Requirement** Institute a university-wide diversity course requirement, with carefully developed guidelines about the types of courses that can fulfill the requirement.

> Our university was founded on a commitment to diversity and inclusion; we believe there is no better time for the university to fully honor that commitment.

> Barnard's[15] "Thinking about Social Difference" and Stanford's[16] "Engaging Diversity" requirements impose narrower guidelines to ensure that students are not just studying different cultures or societies but rather the complex identity, power and interaction dynamics that are introduced when multiple different cultures intersect within a single society. By requiring students to take a course on "Cultural Diversity in the U.S.," Penn[17] is even more explicit about requiring students to study how diversity dynamics impact their immediate societal environment. Perhaps, the best example that we were able to find of a bold institutional commitment to diversity education is at Georgetown,[18] where students are required to take two "Engaging Diversity" courses, one domestic and one global in orientation. Careful attention should be paid to how the requirement is defined so that it is not unduly diluted.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (D4): At a time when societal-level tensions are exacerbating felt divisions among community members, there is a greater need than ever for students, faculty and staff to be able to engage in effective dialogue with people who hold different views and come from different backgrounds. This is especially true in response to trigger events.

One of the most consistent themes that emerged from our outreach with students, faculty and staff has to do with the importance of effective dialogue. There were two aspects to what we heard. First, those who have participated in a workshop or course that was explicitly designed to stimulate deeper-level conversations and unearth people's assumptions (e.g., IDP, CITE) found them to be powerful and worthwhile. Second, people expressed concern about how there seems to be an increasing tendency for people to avoid addressing disagreements or conflict in the moment, and in person. In combination, there is an overwhelming sense that community members need as many opportunities as possible to practice engaging in effective dialogue.

> **Recommendation D.4.1 – Mandatory Dialogue-based Orientation Workshops*** Replace our historical approach of content/awareness-based diversity training during new student orientation with skills-based training, particularly about how to engage in effective dialogue across difference.

---

[15] https://barnard.edu/academics-library/provost-dean-faculty/teaching-curriculum/general-education-requirements
[16] https://undergrad.stanford.edu/programs/ways/ways/engaging-diversity
[17] https://m.college.upenn.edu/node/2504
[18] https://college.georgetown.edu/academics/core-requirements/engaging-diversity

It is critical that all students recognize that being able to engage in constructive dialogue will accelerate their learning and enhance their leadership capacity (and therefore their future careers) and, moreover, that it is an essential competence expected of Cornellians. Workshops should be designed to help students understand how people's lived experiences have been shaped by their place in societal, historical and cultural systems, and that as a result, the lenses through which they see and experience the same set of events can differ. Students should also be introduced to the importance of recognizing differential experiences of privilege. An excellent entrée into this discussion is to acknowledge the Cayuga Nation territory on which Cornell University is situated. These orientation workshops should be delivered in small groups, despite the cost, to personalize the experience and enhance engagement. Given widespread support for the IDP model across campus, the university can leverage its approach and deploy IDP-trained facilitators to deliver the workshops.

We have already stated our recommendation that first-year students receive orientation training on how to engage in productive dialogue across dimensions of difference and, furthermore, that what they learned be intentionally role modeled and applied within their living/learning communities. The value of integrating more dialogue-based programming throughout the FYE was echoed by members of the Student Assembly's Academic Policy Committee. In fact, there was strong consensus across many different outreach conversations that greater investment in a shared FYE is important for developing stronger identification with the Cornell community, clearer understanding of our core values and more integrated social networks.

Recommendation D.4.2 – Reinforce Orientation Training* Reinforce the impact of what students learn through IDP orientation workshops by training students in key positions of influence using the same IDP-based framework.

The recent decision to require diversity-related training for all Greek leaders and new members offers an excellent opportunity to reinforce what students learn in their orientation workshops. Also, as described in section G below, leaders of student organizations have also expressed a desire for additional support. Providing IDP-led training for them will further reinforce the importance of dialogue-based inquiry and leadership. Although these post-orientation workshops should revisit some of the key principles and tools taught during orientation, they should also include distinct content that extends the range of students' awareness and behavioral repertoire. Training should be offered not just for undergraduate students but for leaders of graduate and professional student organizations as well.

Recommendation D.4.3 – Parallel Training for Residential Leaders** Provide parallel workshops to faculty, staff and student advisors on North and West Campus so that they reinforce what students have learned by adopting similar language and dialogue tools to facilitate difficult conversations and resolve conflicts within students' living and learning communities.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (D.5): Hundreds of teaching assistants interact directly with undergraduate students in the classroom each semester, yet only some of them receive TA training.

> **Recommendation D.5 – Guarantee TA training**** Guarantee that teaching assistants, many of whom have little or no prior teaching experience, receive structured orientation prior to assuming their roles.
>
> We repeatedly heard concerns about the limited training provided to teaching assistants in many colleges. Although it is understandable that instructional demands vary across the disciplines and therefore TA training may be more appropriately designed within the colleges, all TAs should receive standardized training about inclusive pedagogical practices. The College of Engineering already offers extensive training to its TAs and, as such, may serve as a valuable model for other colleges.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (D.6): There is disagreement and confusion among faculty about what their role is and is not when it comes to responding to bias incidents.

Throughout the past academic year, students expressed frustration about how few of the faculty/instructors of their courses acknowledged bias incidents that had occurred. They explained how their faculty were often the first "adults" or university employees with whom they had contact following an incident, and that the lack of acknowledgment made them feel like the university was out of touch and/or did not care about the well-being of students. Based on this feedback, the Center for Teaching Innovation emailed a set of tips on how faculty could address bias incidents in their classes. After the last publicly reported incident in March of 2018, the dean of faculty and the Office of Faculty Development and Diversity also sent messages to faculty and instructors to encourage them to acknowledge the bias incident, even if only by showing a power point slide that listed the campus resources that are available to students. According to feedback we collected from students, however, it seemed that despite these efforts, many students continued to report that hardly any of their faculty mentioned anything about the bias incident in their classes.

Although many faculty in their written responses to the task force survey expressed appreciation for the guidance provided by CTI, others expressed confusion and even resentment about the classroom responses that might be expected of them. Some faculty expressed legitimate concern, stating that their primary objective and responsibility when it comes to students is to teach the subject matter they've been hired to teach based on their expertise, and nothing more.

Sample comments from faculty who perceive that their role as educators includes the responsibility to support students in a holistic way include:

- *"Faculty have a responsibility and obligation to provide this kind of support to students or at least to point them in the direction of resources that can support them. Too many faculty just don't see that this is part of their job – like teaching and advising, they compete for time with what really matters – research."*
- *"How do we talk about these important topics or address what is happening on campus in the classroom? I honestly have no idea how to have these conversations or facilitate a discussion in class, and I feel that that is unacceptable. These are intense times, when hate and bigotry are front and center in our politics. This is on top of the experiences that a lot of our students, staff, and faculty have with systemic barriers. How can I validate my students' experiences and concerns in the classroom?"*

Sample comments from faculty who feel the opposite include:

- *"I don't feel comfortable addressing diversity-related topics in class. I teach engineering, and I think I lose credibility with students if I bring up non-engineering topics."*
- *"Although I recognize that students need to discuss these issues, it is not the appropriate time during a 50 minute class. It is easy for such discussions to eat into time needed to teach – that does not serve the students' interests."*

Some faculty expressed concern not about the appropriateness of serving as first responders in some capacity, but rather about the burden of having to do so. For example:

- *"More and more demands are being placed on faculty without anything ever being taken off the table. The university should hire more staff who have training and expertise in these areas so faculty can refer students to professionals whose jobs are to help them. It is time consuming and exhausting trying to manage these kinds of challenges on top of everything else we are supposed to do. This is especially true for women, faculty of color, LGBTQ faculty, etc. who are already doing a lot of invisible mentoring and support."*
- *"At some point, we have to acknowledge that (largely due to budget constraints) we cannot continue to add additional layers of responsibility (instruction, administration, etc.) onto faculty to keep this ship moving forward. We rarely have the discussion that something has to give in these situations. We continue to add new initiatives without removing old initiatives to balance what we are capable of doing. This has a strong impact on faculty burnout and I do not see this getting any better."*

Some faculty were somewhat more neutral in describing their uncertainty:

- *"It's hard to know how to address issues around race in a way that is both academically accurate and politically neutral, so as not to alienate students with different political backgrounds."*
- *"I don't know what more I can or am supposed to do than empathize and then orient students toward the appropriately appointed specialists."*

Overall, what we learned from this input is that faculty are unsure, or disagree, about what their role ought to be in responding to bias incidents, and thus there is a need to offer clarity in this regard, followed by relevant guidance and training.

Recommendation D.6.1 – Communicate Expectations for Faculty Response to Bias Incidents* Clarify for faculty that the most important thing they can do for students is to demonstrate empathy and show that they care for the well-being of students.

Most faculty who choose not to discuss bias incidents in their classes are afraid to do so because they are concerned that they might say the wrong thing or be unable to effectively facilitate a tense or emotional conversation. When we explained this to students, most said that they didn't expect to have a full-blown discussion about the incident in class, but would have appreciated hearing something like, "I read about the incident and realize that some of you may feel quite distressed. Please remember to reach out for support," with some reference to available resources.

Along these lines, faculty could be encouraged to post announcements periodically on their course website to remind students of their availability through office hours, as well as about resources that exist on campus for specialized support.

Recommendation D.6.2 – Raise Faculty Awareness about Professional Support for Students* On an annual basis, (re-)educate faculty about available student support resources on campus.

Faculty need guidance about student support resources on campus. Responses to questions in the task force survey about how prepared they feel to respond appropriately to students who present with a wide variety of needs revealed that academic staff feel unprepared to respond to the types of needs that may be increasing in prevalence with the continuing diversification of the student body (See Table 2). These include knowing how to respond to current events related to diversity, incidents of perceived bias or discrimination, accommodations for disabilities, and concerns about physical safety or violence. Faculty reported feeling least prepared to respond appropriately to needs that are most likely among low-income students (financial troubles and food insecurity). There were no significant differences across faculty based on gender, socio-economic status when growing up, or status as a first-generation college student.

Assistant professors feel significantly less prepared than tenured faculty to respond to student needs related to family crises, emotional or social challenges, food insecurity, financial troubles, academic support, incidents of perceived bias or discrimination, and accommodations for disabilities. Notably, however, they are not any less prepared to respond to current events related to diversity. Correlational analyses suggest that the observed differences could be due to their lower participation in diversity training, but are likely compounded by the fact that they are less experienced than tenured faculty.

Interestingly, however, there were more differences between assistant and associate professors than there were between assistant professors and full professors. Differences based on faculty years of service provide parallel evidence that faculty who have been at Cornell for 11-15 years tend to feel significantly better prepared to address student needs than faculty who have worked at Cornell for fewer or more years.

As one faculty member aptly summarized, "*I would like tips on how to respond to students in need – referral lists of resources for each type of need would be helpful.*"

Recommendation D.6.3 – Deliver Short Workshops to Faculty in their Academic Homes*
Increase faculty exposure to diversity education by bringing it to them rather than relying on them to seek it.

Comments like the following made it clear that a substantial proportion of faculty are aware that they are ill-informed about a range of diversity issues and want guidance: "*I need training on everything diversity-related. It's a no-win snake pit. My feeling is that faculty are often blamed for bad behavior by other students. We're not omnipotent. I feel very unsure about what to say that would not piss off at least some part of the students. I'm very afraid to say the wrong thing. So I try to avoid these topics.*" However, the fact that participation in diversity education remains relatively low suggests that faculty are either unsure about where to turn to educate themselves or encounter barriers to participation. Faculty who were aware of workshops such as the Faculty Institute for Diversity often lamented that they simply cannot afford the time to attend such lengthy workshops.

Therefore, there is an urgent need to develop much shorter workshops for faculty and bring them to faculty in their daily lives rather than wait for faculty to seek them out. An example would be to have CITE or CTI present for one hour at an already scheduled faculty meeting. The hope is that even one hour of content is better than none, but that furthermore, the exposure would make faculty more likely to seek follow-up guidance from these training providers.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (D.7): Many staff are interested in learning more about minoritized identity groups. However, not all of these staff feel supported by their supervisors to participate in workshops or have not yet sought out relevant workshops.

Results from the task force survey revealed that compared to academic staff/faculty (~50 percent), a much smaller proportion (19 percent) of nonacademic staff report never having participated in diversity-related workshops or training (i.e., ~80 percent of staff respondents have participated in some form of diversity-related education; see Table 3).[19] Although the

---

[19] It's worth noting that although there were no discernable gender differences in the data collected through the task force survey, findings should be interpreted with caution due to incomplete data (survey response rate for staff was 22.61 percent). Recent data from the Department of Inclusion and Workforce Diversity about participation rates (which do not include participation in diversity programming offered by units outside of HR)

focus of the question for nonacademic staff was more general ("training or courses designed to help you develop the awareness and skills you need to interact effectively with people or cultures and identities outside your own") rather than student-focused, the difference in participation rates is nevertheless quite striking. These survey-based findings were echoed in various in-person outreach meetings in which people expressed frustration about the fact that faculty are not held to the same standard as staff when it comes to training.

Survey results showed that participation rates did not differ based on the demographic background of staff respondents. However, staff hired within the last five years are significantly more likely to report having participated in training *and* remembering the content well enough to apply it as compared to staff with longer employment tenure. Although this is not surprising, it serves as a reminder of the importance of offering refresher courses for staff, particularly given evolving campus demographics and political dynamics.

Indeed, data we received from the Office of Human Resources for FY16 and FY17 indicate that 10 percent of Cornell staff attended one or more programs delivered by the Inclusive Excellence Academy for staff. While it is certainly the case that staff also participate in programming that is offered outside of the HR's Inclusive Excellence Academy (e.g., in their own college or unit), the data do suggest that many staff would likely benefit from continuing education.

This was echoed in the written responses staff provided to the task force survey, in which many respondents asked for training related to a wide range of identities, with the most frequent requests for awareness training being for transgender issues and/or sexual orientation and the next most frequent for issues related to international and DACA students.

Like faculty, nonacademic staff were asked how prepared they feel to respond to a wide range of student needs and reported similar levels of preparedness across categories (Table 4). However, compared to academic staff, they feel more prepared to address student needs associated with food insecurity, financial troubles and concerns about physical safety or violence. Overall, white staff report feeling significantly less prepared to respond to students' reactions to current events related to diversity compared to staff of color.

> **Recommendation D.7.1 – Require Diversity Education for Student-Facing Staff**** Although all staff with an interest in raising their awareness about different identity groups and

---

revealed that women are over-represented in Inclusive Excellence Academy workshops compared to men (80 percent of IEA attendees are women although they represent 63 percent of total staff; men represent 20 percent of IEA attendees and 37 percent of total staff). Similarly, staff of color are also over-represented in IEA workshops (staff of color represent 20 percent of IEA attendees and 12 percent of total staff; white staff represent 80 percent of IEA attendees and 88 percent of total staff). Crossing race and gender revealed that white males represent 32 percent of the staff population, but only represent 14 percent of the staff who have attended the IEA (Appendix 5 for more details). Thus, self-selection into diversity-related workshops is likely more skewed than the survey data suggest.

developing skills should be actively supported to do so, student-facing staff should be required to participate in diversity education on an annual basis.

The rationale for requiring this training is not just to ensure staff readiness; it is also to eliminate the likelihood that supervisors object to their participation.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (D.8): We also learned in our discussions with student advisors that there is no standardized approach for training staff who are hired into advising roles.

Even among those who happened to be hired into a college that offered some form of structured peer mentoring when they were hired, participation in diversity education since is rare. There is a tendency to assume that individuals who belong to a minoritized identity group "just get it" while members of majority groups do not. Such beliefs are not only inaccurate, but also problematic because they disempower majority-group staff from feeling capable of serving students from diverse backgrounds and because they perpetuate blind spots for members of marginalized groups (i.e., an individual's understanding of what it is like to be a member of a particular identity group does not necessarily generalize to other members of the same group, nor to members of other minoritized groups).

Recommendation D.8.1 – Develop Protocol for Onboarding Student Services Staff*
Convene a group to examine existing training and professional development practices of student advisors across the university, conduct a training needs assessment and devise a coordinated strategy to be deployed in the 2019-20 academic year.

Recommendation D.8.2 – Establish Structured Professional Network of Student Services Staff*
Designate a point person for overseeing the development of a structured professional network of student services staff. Allocate a budget for supporting professional development activities and quarterly network meetings.

Student services staff expressed a strong desire for the university to support the development of a learning-oriented professional network that spans all colleges and relevant central units (e.g., OADI, Dean of Students, Career Services). Once established, such a network would help student advisors to capitalize on their collective expertise to respond in more agile ways to ever-evolving student needs (e.g., DACA, effective responses to particular bias incidents, etc.). It could also serve as the basis for a central repository of resources for student advisors.

Section E: Assessment of Inclusive Leadership and Pedagogy

Problem/challenge to be addressed (E.1): Faculty and staff who themselves belong to minoritized identity groups tend to take on a disproportionate amount of unrecognized work

associated with supporting students, serving on committees and contributing to initiatives that promote community.

Recommendation E.1.1 – Formal Rewards*** Establish presidential grants for faculty who do a disproportionate amount of this work. Allow funds to be used to buy-out a course, apply toward research or pay summer salary.

Systems for reward and recognition should include non-tenure-track faculty who tend to feel undervalued for their service to the university.

Recommendation E.1.2 – University-wide Awards* Establish presidential awards to recognize faculty, staff and students from across the university who have contributed in exemplary ways to improve campus climate.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (E.2): Treatment by one's manager [instructor] has an enormous impact on experiences of inclusion, both positive and negative, but there currently are not adequate mechanisms in place for capturing the quality of supervision [teaching] and responding appropriately to both excellent and poor leadership.

The task force survey asked respondents to describe the type of experience that makes them feel like they belong at Cornell. Consistent with years of data collected from millions of working adults by Gallup, the quality of an individual's relationship with their immediate supervisor is a critical predictor of engagement and inclusion. A total of 186 staff members described positive interactions working with colleagues in their department as their source of feelings of belonging at Cornell, although Black/African American and Hispanic staff were less likely to provide written responses associated with this theme. An illustrative comment is, "*Working with my immediate staff team I felt a sense of belonging. We have a diverse team and our leader very deliberately listens to and encourages the voices of those who have historically been marginalized; he amplifies those voices…Through those actions, I felt I belonged – I am not from a traditionally marginalized population, but when one ensures that those who are most likely to be discriminated against experience a sense of belonging we all benefit and feel valued…and thus feel that we all matter and belong.*"

Survey respondents were also asked what makes them feel like they do not belong, are un-welcomed or not supported to succeed. Respondents described seemingly simple and obvious things like not feeling recognized, heard or valued by their immediate supervisor as the reason they do not feel liked a valued member of the community (i.e., belonging, inclusion).

Because of the direct influence that a manager has over direct reports, individuals unfortunately feel powerless about improving their situation. Oftentimes, this means that needed feedback is not making its way back to supervisors; thus, their frustrations remain unaddressed, and those managers who might benefit from leadership coaching remain

unidentified as long as they maintain their task-related performance. In the extreme cases, this leads to regrettable turnover.

Given our need to improve the retention of staff of color and those from other marginalized identity groups, it is imperative that mechanisms for detecting and addressing problems associated with workgroup climate be put in place. The 62 percent increase in staff utilization of the Faculty and Staff Assistance Program (FSAP) since January 2017 suggests that workplace interactions have become a more serious source of stress within the current political context.

Recommendation E.2 – Expand Use of 360° Performance Evaluations** Expand both the content and usage of 360° performance evaluation to ensure that employees have a safe mechanism for providing feedback about the quality of their workgroup climate and treatment by their manager. Develop clear guidelines about how both exceptional and problematic leadership will be identified and recognized.[20]

Currently, some leaders utilize 360° performance feedback mechanisms but not uniformly so, because it is voluntary. According to a survey of staff conducted by Institutional Research and Planning, approximately half of respondents have been asked to provide anonymous feedback to the manager of their supervisor. Others have been asked for feedback directly by their supervisor. However, of those asked, only a little over half have taken advantage of the opportunity to provide feedback, mostly out of concern for retaliation.

Often, 360° instruments rely on a combination of rated survey questions and opportunities to provide written feedback. It is the written portion that employees worry about most because their choice of words or examples could give away their identity. One way to provide greater protection to employees while also gathering valuable feedback for the supervisor about the quality of their leadership is to expand the content that is covered by the questions that are scored on a Likert-type rating scale. The identification of additional questions to include could be informed both by relevant academic research and by the themes that emerged in respondents' textual responses to the task force survey and those that have been identified by support professionals on campus (e.g., University Ombudsman, FSAP, HR, etc.). However, developing a more comprehensive set of 360° evaluation questions will only be useful if there are clear expectations that supervisors utilize it to gather input and there is clarity about how the results will be used (i.e., for developmental versus evaluative purposes).

---

[20] There is a parallel need to make sure that there are mechanisms in place for students to report experiences of poor classroom climate or interpersonal bias without fear of retaliation. It is essential that any such process provide clear definitions about what constitutes bias, and explanations about how student input will be utilized.

An alternative is to include a set of questions in the employee survey that are clearly focused on one's unit leader and climate and to analyze and report survey results back to that unit leader with the expectation that the leader will collaborate with employees to interpret survey results and collectively develop action plans for how to address areas of concern. This is the process that is used by many organizations that are thought of as "highly engaged" organizations; however, successful deployment of this strategy requires that the unit of analysis be clearly defined and that HR coaches are available to help unit leaders understand what the results mean.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (E.3): Unless faculty receive a clear message that promoting an inclusive campus experience through their teaching and service represents an important criterion for evaluating faculty excellence, efforts to promote diversity and inclusion will be shouldered by an overburdened minority of faculty and progress will be slow.

This is problematic because interactions with faculty represent one of the most important influences on students' experiences of inclusion on campus. Unfortunately, not all faculty are equipped with the information and skills needed to respond effectively to the realities of an increasingly diverse student body.

In the task force's online survey, academic staff were asked to indicate whether they had participated in workshops or training designed to address diversity issues in the classroom (see Table 5). The survey included questions about workshops or training related to the following: how to create inclusive classroom climates, address bias, teach effectively to students with different learning styles, recognize and support students in distress, provide additional academic support to students who may need it, and respond to requests for accommodations from students with disabilities.

On average, approximately 50 percent of academic staff respondents indicated that they had participated in such educational opportunities (rates varied slightly depending on content). However, we suspect that this may reflect an overestimation given survey response bias (i.e., faculty who care about diversity are more likely to have responded to the task force survey). There were no significant gender differences in participation rates, nor were there differences based on whether the faculty were themselves first-generation college students, alumni of Cornell, or from low-income backgrounds. Interestingly, participation rates for many of the types of training were significantly higher among lecturers than tenure-track faculty. Among tenure-track faculty, assistant professors were significantly less likely than tenured faculty to participate in training related to how to provide additional academic support to students who may need it. This could be a result of their more limited awareness of available resources on campus.

There are a number of strategies that can be used to motivate faculty commitment to diversity and inclusion, including their participation in diversity education. They are reflected in recommendations E.3.1 – E.3.4 below.

Recommendation E.3.1 – Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure** Revise faculty guidelines for promotion and tenure so that descriptions of "excellence" in teaching and service explicitly describe the importance of promoting inclusion in the classroom and in the Cornell community.

Recommendation E.3.2 – "Contributions to Diversity and Inclusion" Statement in Application Materials* Require applicants for faculty (and administrative) positions to include a statement in their application materials about contributions to diversity and inclusion.

The intent is for applicants to describe relevant skills, expertise and experience, as well as their philosophy and willingness to contribute to initiatives that will advance the university's diversity, equity and inclusion goals.

Recommendation E.3.3 – Annual "Contributions to Diversity and Inclusion" Updates** Require faculty to include a diversity and inclusion statement in both their annual reports and in tenure and promotion materials.

Statements should describe the specific actions faculty have taken to contribute to greater diversity and inclusion within their academic departments, courses, research groups and other learning opportunities. Teaching statements should include reflections about pedagogical strategies employed to promote constructive dialogue in and outside the classroom and enhance the inclusion experiences of students from diverse backgrounds. College deans have the discretion to formalize this even more by linking the content of annual reports to merit pay (SIP) increases.

Recommendation E.3.4 – Teaching Evaluations** Convene a task force of experts in assessment, instructional methods and learning outcomes to carefully review the teaching evaluations currently used across colleges and recommend revisions to be adopted immediately.

For many students, their experiences in the classroom are what signal to them whether or not they are a valued member of our university community. Including evaluation questions that assess classroom climate would signal to students that the university is taking their concerns seriously. It would also heighten faculty awareness about the importance of attending to these issues, and might motivate faculty to seek teaching resources to improve their performance in this regard.

A priority is to supplement currently available two- and three-day workshops offered by the Faculty Institute for Diversity (of the Center for Teaching Innovation; CTI) with short, bite-sized workshops that can be delivered in the academic "homes" of faculty. To enhance participation, department chairs and deans can arrange for these workshops to be delivered during already scheduled faculty meetings.

Another goal should be the identification and removal of vague teaching evaluation questions that are most prone to unconscious bias in response patterns. Research shows that female faculty and faculty of color tend to suffer from negative biases in their teaching evaluations, particularly in disciplines where they are underrepresented. Given the role that teaching evaluations have in promotion and tenure reviews, this is obviously a problem.[21]

Section F: Enhancing Social Belonging and Engagement Across Difference

Problem/challenge to be addressed (F.1): There continue to be perceived inequities in access to academic and professional development opportunities that need to be addressed proactively.

Foundational to experiencing inclusion and social belonging is perceiving that one has just as much of an opportunity (and right) to participate in the activities that define the Cornell community. According to Gallup (a U.S.-based global performance management consulting company that is well known for its survey research), students' sense of connectedness to the university (as reported upon graduation) is strongly influenced by: (1) *support* – whether professors cared about the student as a person, having a mentor that encouraged the student, and having at least one professor who excited the student about learning; and (2) *experiential learning* – whether the student was active in organizations and extracurricular activities, worked on a project that took a semester or more to complete, and having had an internship that allowed them to apply what they learned in the classroom.

Based on the known importance of people's perceptions of fairness and equity for experiencing inclusion, the task force survey included questions about perceived equity of access among students to a wide range of opportunities and resources. We learned that although the university has made significant strides in enhancing financial accessibility to learning opportunities and has increased investments in student support services, there continue to be some ways in which sorting and segregation among students continue. Findings from the survey inform a number of the recommendations that appear below.

We first highlight areas of the curricular and co-curricular experience in which students perceive that access to opportunities are not always equitable. We then delve into issues related to students' extracurricular and social experiences.

Overall, graduate students responded positively when asked in the task force survey about the equity of access to funding, research, academic/learning, professional development,

---

[21] In fact, some universities have completely moved away from teaching evaluations: https://www.insidehighered.com/node/245386

and social and community engagement opportunities (see Tables 6a, 6b and 6c). There were no significant differences based on race/ethnicity or gender. Similarly, among undergraduates, respondents tended to "agree" or "strongly agree" that access to a wide range of student opportunities is equitable (see Tables 7a and 7b). However, first-generation students and students with female or non-binary gender identities (i.e., non-male) were significantly less likely to feel that access to research opportunities is equitable. Written responses to the task force survey revealed additional concerns about global opportunities and internships, as well as specific concerns among students who are not U.S. citizens.

Recommendation F.1.1 – Research Opportunities** Strongly encourage departments across the university to post open research positions through the Student Experience platform[22] so that there is an open marketplace for research opportunities; in so doing, identify obstacles that might inhibit faculty from participating.

Although we did not detect significant differences in perceptions about equitable access to research opportunities among graduate students based on social identity, in their open-ended responses to the task force survey, over 50 undergraduates described challenges associated with becoming involved in research. Illustrative comments include the following:

- *"It is not easy to learn how to find undergrad research opportunities if you have no knowledge of academic from people you know. I personally struggled a lot with this, as it was hard for me to even know how the process worked at all for the longest of times, while I know some peers knew how it worked before even setting foot on campus. Privilege seems to play a huge role here."*
- *"Research opportunities are very competitive and the resources to help with finding them are not well advertised, and people that could be the perfect fit for something don't want to apply if their grades are low because they know they won't get the position. This doesn't make sense because the people who need research the most are students who may not excel with taking exams but are great with working hands-on in a lab."[23]*
- *"I can personally attest that research opportunities are not accessible to students of financially difficult backgrounds as to students of wealthy backgrounds. Often,*

---

[22] https://experience.cornell.edu/

[23] This comment raises an interesting issue about the "bona fide job requirements" for working in a research lab. Depending on the nature of the work, having good grades might not be a necessary job requirement. In fact, having the opportunity to work in a lab and get excited about a specific area may be just what some students need to ignite their passion for learning.

labs don't have the money to pay students for summer research, but will take volunteers and pay them in academic credit."

- *"A more centralized undergraduate research center would also change the undergraduate experience, as many freshmen coming in don't know where to go for opportunities, and many professors have openings."*

Recommendation F.1.2 – Global Opportunities* Encourage each college (and their respective departments) to identify and address obstacles to participation in international learning opportunities.

For majors that impose more degree requirements (e.g., engineering, pre-health), this may require identifying or developing winter and summer opportunities that do not interfere with students' ability to take required courses, aggressively searching for university partners abroad that offer a generous number of high-quality courses that could satisfy degree requirements, and/or incentivizing instructors to offer a "global lab" component to core curricular courses.

Colleges should be aware that students from low-income backgrounds and transfer students were significantly more likely to express frustrations about inequitable access to international opportunities in their open text responses to the task force survey. Therefore, special attention should be paid to addressing the barriers that are more acutely felt by these student populations. Students from low-income backgrounds may not be aware of the funding sources available to support their participation in special learning opportunities.

Recommendation F.1.3 – Internships* Seek donor support to establish a university-wide internship grant program to make volunteer and low-paying internships financially accessible to students from lower-income backgrounds.

Many internships are unpaid or pay very little, which excludes students from lower-income backgrounds who cannot afford to forgo the opportunity to earn money (including to save for the mandated student contribution to financial aid). Because internships are increasingly seen as essential for obtaining future employment, this exacerbates stress and anxiety for these students.

Recommendation F.1.7 – International Students* Enhance efforts within relevant central (e.g., Global Cornell, International Students and Scholars Office, Office of Career Services) and college (e.g., career services, student services, internship programs) units to identify career development and income-generating opportunities for international students and ensure that they are easy for international students to find.

International students (particularly professional students) bemoan the fact that many internships (and fellowships) are only open to U.S. citizens. This is a particularly pressing concern among international students who are struggling financially and are unable to find income-generating opportunities.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (F.2): Forces that exacerbate *social* sorting, segregation, status differences and exclusion in students' extracurricular lives need to be examined more carefully, with the goal of counteracting those forces whenever possible.

With regard to students' experiences of belonging, we learned through our conversations with Cornell Health's Skorton Center for Health Initiatives staff, Public Health Fellows, Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) counselors, and student advisors that loneliness is an issue for many students. It can take a while for students to adjust to their new environment, make meaningful friendships and figure out how to find micro-communities where they feel they belong. When they look around and see other students who appear to be involved and have friends, it's difficult for them not to feel like the outlier when in fact we know from research that these feelings are much more common than they are visible. Challenges associated with finding community and needed resources are exacerbated by Cornell's complex and decentralized structure, and as such would be ameliorated at least in part by the development of a centralized, dynamic and searchable source of information for students (see Recommendation C.1.1).

It is worth noting that numerous faculty, staff and students cautioned that we focus our energy not only on trying to deliver solutions for promoting a sense of belonging for students, but also on encouraging students to be proactive about shaping their experiences. There is no shortage of opportunities and resources at Cornell; sometimes what students need is a little bit of guidance and to be prompted by questions such as, "what actions have *you* taken to find community or a sense of belonging?"

Among undergraduates, although perceptions about equitable access to opportunities were overall quite favorable (see Tables 7a and 7b), perceptions of equity were least favorable for participation in professional student organizations where 42 percent strongly disagreed or disagreed, and for Greek life, where 56 percent strongly disagreed or disagreed. There were no significant differences based on race-ethnicity across any of the opportunities, but female students perceived access to Greek and professional student organizations to be less equitable than their male peers.[24] Although caution should be taken not to overinterpret these results given the small survey response rate among undergraduate students, the

---

[24] Female students also perceived greater inequities in access to research opportunities, leadership development, RA and TA positions, and international opportunities than their male peers.

notion that the exclusivity of Greek and professional student organizations contributes to perceptions of a negative campus climate surfaced in many of our outreach discussions.

The root causes of perceptions of inequitable access to these organizations should continue to be examined more carefully and addressed to whatever extent possible. Below, we present recommendations related to the opportunities and structures that emerged as being among the most salient forces that separate students or limit their sense of belonging.

Recommendation F.2.1a – Greek Life Recruiting* Establish a mechanism that allows students to report experiences of incivility during the recruiting process – particularly those that appear to be motivated visible social identity characteristics – and include aggregate statistics in the scorecard[25] of Greek chapters.

We repeatedly heard in our outreach that the recruiting practices of fraternities and sororities are exclusionary, and that many chapter members are outwardly disrespectful. Students tended to comment in particular about discrimination based on ethnicity/race, financial background and sexual orientation, which are compounded by the lack of transparency about standards for admission. Many students also indicated that they thought that the recruitment process is just for show, and that actual admission decisions are made based on friendship networks before recruitment even begins. Below we share illustrative comments collected from the task force survey and from the Interfraternity Council post-recruitment survey.

– *As soon as people joined Greek life I felt unwelcome. I rushed for two days before I became keenly aware that I was only called back to the "diverse" sororities. After everyone joined their clubs/groups, I felt like I was confined to "browntown" for my friend group. I feel like part of the reason we are so segregated is for protection. Two of my friends were turned away from a Frat party because the party "wasn't for people like them." It is these kinds of experiences that make us feel like campus can be hostile.*
– *"…most brothers were playing video games etc. and seemed to have very little interest in meeting new freshmen. Almost as though they already knew who they wanted and the idea of open houses was only because they had to do it."*
– *"Brothers of the house didn't make any effort to talk to rushes and when I did talk to brothers, they wouldn't look at me and held their chin up high, like they were better than everyone who wasn't in their house."*
– *"It's insulting to go to a house and have all the brothers avoid talking with you."*

---

[25]

- *"It was very obvious houses had dirty rushed most of their pledge class by the time rush week started…brothers were standoffish to people they'd never seen before, like what is rush week even for then?"*

Recommendation F.2.1b – Physical Spaces in the Greek Community* With renovations to the former house of Psi Upsilon as well as concrete planning for the expansion of university housing underway, communicate a specific plan for allocating physical space for multicultural Greek chapters to live in and/or use for programming. The lack of physical space for historically black fraternities and sororities continues to be felt as a significant source of inequity.

Recommendation F.2.1c – Enhance Transparency About the Cost of Joining Greek Life* Charge each Greek chapter to provide full transparency about their organization's dues prior to the start of recruitment and to lower dues whenever possible.

Recommendation F.2.1d – Provide Financial Assistance to Pay Greek Dues*** Address financial constraints to joining Greek life by establishing a scholarship fund to help offset financial barriers to joining a Greek organization, and charge all Greek chapters to do their part to contribute scholarship funds through fundraising.

If students have complete information about dues structures and also know whether their application for a scholarship has been accepted prior to the start of the recruitment process, they can participate in recruiting without having to disclose their financial status with the chapters they hope to join.

Recommendation F.2.2 – Physical Safety* Actively consider ways to respond to student concerns about physical safety.

Students spoke highly of the mobile app that can connect them to rides to get home late at night, and the few who were aware of the Rave Guardian Safety App also applauded the extra support from the university. Others expressed a desire for more street lighting and visible police presence at night. In a conversation with members of Black Students United, students indicated that they would like to see surveillance cameras installed throughout campus.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (F.3): Structures and opportunities that facilitate engagement and integration across boundaries of difference need to be expanded.

Academic research has shown that although identity-specific centers designed to reduce feelings of marginalization provide a sense of community, they can also have unintended negative consequences. Because they do not promote a sense of common identity with

members of other groups, identity specific-spaces can increase perceptions of zero-sum competition ("we" versus "they") and ethnic/cultural victimization. Furthermore, the appearance of clustering is often interpreted by students as a failure of the university's diversity and inclusion efforts. Therefore, it is important to balance the desire for identity-specific spaces (which we address in section F.4 below) with the creation of more opportunities for intercultural interactions. This is reflected in the words of a faculty member with research expertise related to diversity and inclusion, who said, "*We need to promote greater integration. The more we perpetuate sorting of any kind, the deeper the boundaries. Dialogue in integrated spaces will provide for a much richer educational experience.*"

Recommendation F.3.1a – Engaged Learning Opportunities in Living/Learning Communities** Offer engaged learning courses to cohorts of students from residential halls.

Engaged learning courses provide positive intergroup contact experiences that facilitate the development of meaningful relationships across identity boundaries. When courses are embedded within living communities, students have a greater chance of maintaining friendships following the conclusion of the course. If offered as part of the FYE, they will also provide opportunities for students to develop strong (and more diverse) friendships. As one student who had participated in a global community-engaged course during his junior year described, "*it would provide meaningful alternatives for friendship circles and might even influence which [Greek] house you join (or whether you join).*" As his classmates explained, "*when you're off-campus and away from the status cues that divide us on campus, your shared identity as a group becomes more salient and new friendships are not just possible but guaranteed*."

Students, staff and faculty with whom we spoke were enthusiastic about offering engaged courses with an extended off-campus component to be offered over the (otherwise underutilized) winter session.

Recommendation F.3.1b – Engaged Learning Experiences for All Students*** Require that all students participate in some form of community-engaged learning prior to graduation; make this one of the distinctive hallmarks what it means to be Cornell-educated.

The overarching goal of the Engaged Cornell initiative as supported by the Einhorn Family Trust is to reach a point where 100 percent of students participate in community-engaged learning prior to graduating. Many feel that instituting such a requirement would help us to go all the way in owning our mission as the only land-grant Ivy League institution. Faculty and staff who live in the North and West Campus residence halls also

expressed their desire to offer an intense experiential learning experience to all students as a means of facilitating personal development, dialogue and friendship building.

Recommendation F.3.2 – Freshman Housing** Eliminate the option for incoming first-year students to choose their roommates.[26]

Under the current structure, incoming students identify peers from their high school district who have also been accepted to Cornell and request to be housed with them. This practice perpetuates homogeneous networks and makes it less likely for students to reach out and make new friends from different backgrounds. Interestingly, research suggests that integrated spaces are also safer for students in that more racially integrated campuses drink less alcohol than more segregated ones. This is also true when first-year students are mixed in with sophomores and juniors.

Such a change would have to be supported by greater investments in integration-enhancing activities, for example experiential learning opportunities based out of the residential halls (recommendation F.3.1a) and opportunities for dialogue led by IDP-trained facilitators who are assigned to support the residential halls.

Recommendation F.3.3 – Create a Multicultural Student Center*** Create a multicultural student center that is designed to preserve (not replace) identity-specific cultural centers while also supporting intersectionality and multicultural programming. Such a center should contain mixed-use spaces that can be used to host social events.

Results from the task force survey indicated that of the different opportunities undergraduates might have to interact meaningfully with people from different backgrounds, people regard impromptu, informal interactions as the most effective (see Figure 2). A multicultural student center that is seen as *the* place for students to mingle would go a long way in facilitating such interactions.

Recommendation F.3.4 – Use of Common Spaces* Engage students in a space study of their residence halls and come up with ideas for how common spaces can be used better or differently so as to facilitate a more welcoming and interactive community.

Faculty, staff and student advisors on North and West Campus shared numerous examples or spaces that are currently underutilized but, with some creative input, could be fun to repurpose (e.g., upstairs in Noyes; the "dungeon" in McFadden).

---

[26] Other universities, for example Stanford and Duke, have recently implemented this change.

Recommendation F.3.5 – Intercultural Programming Grants* Offer university-sponsored grants designed explicitly to support collaboration among student organizations (including Greek chapters) in their efforts to offer intercultural programming.

Leaders of student organizations that have been active in responding to campus climate issues indicated a desire to have their efforts supported by the university. In particular, they advocated that a special fund that is supported by the central administration and not the SAFC be created to support their community-building initiatives.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (F.4): Need for more advocacy and investments in physical spaces for identity groups that currently feel undersupported.

Although we heard widespread support for more multicultural event spaces and programming, people were also clear about the need to continue investing in identity-specific spaces and advocacy. This was true not only among students but also among faculty and staff (for example, members of the Colleague Network Groups). As a faculty member explained, "*We need to focus on creating additional spaces for those who have been oppressed systematically for centuries, so that they and all can live and thrive. Operating in such a heteronormative space can be very damaging for many community members. We need to provide space to support those from non-dominant communities.*"

Recommendation F.4.1 – Disability Cultural Resource Center** Establish a disability cultural resource center at Cornell, under the leadership of the dean of students.[27]

We heard repeatedly that despite the fact that the number of students with disabilities has more than doubled in seven years (from 798 in 2009-10 to 1884 in 2016-17), disability is not adequately recognized as an important dimension of diversity. There is an urgent need to establish a disability cultural resource center to provide a sense of community for students with disabilities. This need is evident not only in what we heard in our conversations with members of CUDA (Cornell Union for Disabilities Awareness) and SDS (Student Disability Services), but also in the fact that the CAPS support group for people with chronic illness has a huge waitlist of students.

In addition, professional staff associated with such a Disability Cultural Resource Center could contribute in multiple ways: (a) play an instrumental role in raising awareness about the experiences of individuals with a broad range of disabilities;[28] (b) help to lead the charge to improve the physical, web, communication and programmatic accessibility of all units, offices and colleges within Cornell; (c) help the university to better

---

[27] Syracuse University offers an excellent model: http://sudcc.syr.edu/
[28] People continue to use inappropriate language and have an outdated and limited understanding of disability. Perhaps as a result, there continues to be a strong stigma associated with disclosing one's disability on campus.

understand and address the troubling finding that sexual assault experiences are higher among students with disabilities; and (d) advocate for universal design principles in our pedagogical approaches.

Contrary to what many people assume, Cornell's Student Disability Services is neither equipped nor is it meant to serve as a cultural center to promote culture change and awareness. SDS staff explained that there can even be a complex conflict of interest.[29]

Recommendation F.4.2 – Executive Disability Steering Committee* Reinvigorate the executive disability steering committee to develop both a short-term plan to advance the university's disability services and advocacy as well as a long-term strategy. Charge the committee with creating clear line of sight for each executive's domain (i.e., the specific actions for which each executive will be responsible).

Recommendation F.4.3 – Religion Advisory Committee* Establish an advisory committee under the leadership of Cornell United Religious Work (CURW) to promote education about religious diversity and provide guidelines to faculty about religious accommodations for students.

Our conversations with various religious groups on campus as well as the dean of spirituality and meaning-making, together with written responses to the task force survey, revealed a desire among many to educate the community about religious diversity. In addition, although faculty have become more accustomed to providing accommodations to students with disabilities, awareness about religious accommodations remains limited.

CURW chaplains recommended that the university consider instituting a system that would reduce the burden currently felt by students to educate their faculty about holy days within their faith that may lead them to need a religious accommodation. One option would be to have students self-identify (within the central student records system) the religious accommodations that they will require, then have the system auto-generate notices to relevant faculty each semester that contain information about the dates of religious holidays and the students observing them, together with background information about what the holy days symbolize to members of the various faiths and guidelines about the accommodations that should be granted.

---

[29] For instance, because SDS has influence over students to the extent that they are the ones to determine whether an accommodation request is reasonable, they would experience a conflict of interest if expected to engage in advocacy work for which they would need to rely on the voluntary contributions of students with disabilities.

Recommendation F.4.4 – Gender-neutral Bathrooms** Designate more bathrooms across campus as gender-neutral bathrooms.

We learned in our outreach that there are not enough gender-neutral bathrooms on campus, and those that do exist are difficult to find. Therefore, in addition to creating more gender-neutral bathrooms, a map of their locations across campus should be provided (e.g., through the newly created "Find Your Resources" portal).

Recommendation F.4.5 – Extra Counseling Support Following Campus Incidents* Offer additional counseling services following campus incidents, perhaps in the form of pop-up counseling support in various locations across campus (including on North and West Campus).

The desire for more mental health support has the focus of many conversations over the last year. Although Cornell Health has successfully added counselors to its staff since the bias incidents occurred at the beginning of the fall 2017 semester, demand for counseling services continues to outweigh supply. In addition to continuing efforts to recruit more counselors, we suggest that Cornell Health respond to the spikes in demand that follow bias incidents by offering pop-up services after their regular hours.

Recommendation F.4.6 – Support for Social Events** Develop a fund to help cover facilities fees for student groups that want to host social events but do not have access to space.

Section G: Support for Student Organizations

Overview of what we learned

Many students, staff and faculty alike questioned whether the open-access model to student organizations that we currently have in place should be continued. While the ease with which students can create a student organization provides them with great freedom, the fact that 1,240 student organizations currently exist also means that the university cannot properly support them or ensure that they demonstrate the responsibility that we believe to be an important counterpart to freedom. This represents a significant missed opportunity for Cornell to guide students to develop the competencies necessary to become an engaged citizen and enact positive change in ways that are consistent with our core values. Furthermore, the existing model flies in the face of mounting desire among community members to be more united. There appears to be widespread agreement that we are at a pivotal moment in our campus history; there is a strong appetite for some of the burdens of managing student organizations to be shifted back into administration, but to do so without interfering with the self-governance of these organizations.

The overabundance of organizations prevents the university from being able to invest more meaningfully in leadership development and have a focused strategy for the allocation of resources. As one student put it, "*the SAFC [Student Activities Funding Commission] has a $1.5 million annual budget, and yet I'm not sure what we have to show for it. The way in which funds are allocated seems quite arbitrary, and as a result we're falling short when it comes to having positive impact. It is due time to revamp the structure so that the SAFC can allocate funds properly and equitably and with clearer strategic intent.*"

Many students that we interviewed indicated that they are unaware of whether their organization has an advisor or receives university funding, and even struggled to articulate the mission of their organization. We heard many instances of organizations that have been created specifically to compete with existing ones, either by members who experienced interpersonal conflicts and decided to defect and start another version of the organization rather than work through disagreements or personality differences, or by individuals who were denied admission into exclusive organizations. Furthermore, since many of the clubs do not have a clearly articulated mission and may not even be active, students (rightly) expressed concern about the lack of legitimacy associated with being a member, or even a leader, of a club.

The same ambiguity exists for faculty and staff advisors. There is no shared understanding of the value that an advisor contributes to the community when serving as an advisor of a student organization. This means that although some advisors invest significant time and energy into advising, it is not seen as a legitimate service contribution (for promotion and tenure, or in the performance evaluations of staff).

Problem/challenge to be addressed (G.1): The over-proliferation of student organizations goes against students' desire for a more united community.

Both students and staff from Student and Campus Life described the desire (and need) to eliminate duplicate organizations so that student groups can receive more resources, collaborate more effectively to accomplish their goals, and benefit from more organized advising. However, this is no easy task. There is currently very little oversight over the mission, true activity level and membership of the 1,240 existing student organizations; although staff members in the Campus Activities office do what they can to try to connect students with organizations based on shared interests, they struggle to do this effectively since there are no effective monitoring mechanisms in place. In collaboration with administration, the SAFC should carefully consider what would be a more appropriate and manageable number of university-sponsored student organizations, clarify the distinction between university organizations and independent ones, and revise the criteria that are used to distinguish between the different tiers of student organizations.

Students understand that coalition-building across student organizations is important but complain about how difficult it is to do so in the absence of a reliable system for searching

for other student organizations with a mission. They attribute this to the fact that student organizations are not held accountable for communicating updates about their activities or evolving mission.

Recommendation G.1 – Revise Approach to Student Organizations** Re-evaluate and revise the underlying philosophy for student organizations, and clarify the roles and responsibilities of the SAFC and central administration so that they are complementary and, together, further the university's mission as a land-grant university. Once a new model has been articulated, require student organizations to register anew[30] with the university according to established guidelines about membership, reporting, advising and funding.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (G.2): We do not have a shared understanding of what it means (or should mean) to be a member of a student organization. The current system manages organizations in a transactional way and represent a significant missed opportunity for providing a transformational experience for students. Organizations should provide valuable learning experiences for students.

Student leaders report feeling overburdened and that the university does not do enough to support them. Our many conversations with students who belong to student organizations revealed a consistent pattern: students feel that they would benefit from more structured advising and guidance. Although students relish the freedom to run their organizations, they also recognize that they lack the guidance, skills and confidence to develop mission-based action plans and follow through in the implementation of those plans, resolve conflict and disagreements, welcome and work effectively with members from a wide diversity of backgrounds, maintain high levels of member engagement, and serve as effective peer mentors to less experienced students.

Participation in student organizations represents an important part of the overall educational experience for our students. The extracurricular space is one in which students have the opportunity – with proper oversight and structured support – to develop the university-wide core competencies that may not otherwise be reliably taught within their disciplinary curricula.[31] These competencies include the following: multicultural competence, moral and ethical awareness, self-management, and community engagement. As a university, we seek to teach our students not only disciplinary knowledge and the ability to engage in critical thinking, scientific reasoning, self-directed learning, effective communication and the process of discovery, but also to interact respectfully with diverse others, demonstrate awareness of one's self in relation to others, develop leadership skills, manage budgets, link mission with action, and contribute positively to the community of which they are a part. Although we have an office of Student Leadership, Engagement and

---

[30] An option worth considering may be to develop a new platform for the management of student organizations through the Sales Force platform.

[31] See https://www.cornell.edu/strategicplan/appendices.cfm for a list of the university-wide core competencies.

Campus Activities, most student organizations do not have a formal relationship with the office (except to request funding). This represents a significant missed opportunity for both the university and for our students.

Recommendation G.2.1 – Student Leadership Development*** Establish a Student Leadership Academy that offers a credit-bearing structured leadership development curriculum for aspiring student leaders.

Such a Student Leadership Academy could be funded through the reallocation of SAFC funds, investments from the central university or the establishment of an endowment. Ideally, leadership development courses would be offered to cohorts of leaders and include the following elements: self-assessments, case studies, alumni engagement, action planning and a collaborative project designed to help student leaders develop a shared vision for contributing to a positive campus climate.

The option to take an intensive one-week seminar during the winter or summer sessions resonated with many students because it would enable them to focus on the course in the absence of the stress of managing their regular coursework, and it would also offer a more meaningful bonding experience among participants. Participants at the Student Assembly's Diversity and Inclusion Summit expressed a desire for opportunities that facilitate networking across organizations.

Future initiatives in this direction should be integrated with the Certificate in Engaged Leadership that is offered by the Cornell Office of Engagement Initiatives. This recently developed certificate challenges individual students to "bring about the world you wish to see – now and throughout life. Students will develop the skills they need to be an engaged leader." The parallel certificate model that is currently being developed may be ideal for student groups that have community engagement as part of their mission.

Other universities offer many examples from which to borrow. For example, at Ithaca College students attend leadership and training retreats and receive ongoing training through workshops and personal coaching sessions. Boston College requires leaders of all student organizations to complete training to ensure that they develop the knowledge and skills needed to articulate and model the university's mission, manage finances, effectively manage event planning, and seek any additional support they might need. Vanderbilt University has adopted a cohort-based model in which juniors[32] who have been identified as rising leaders participate in an eight-week leadership development program. In half-semester courses at Johns Hopkins University, students

---

[32] Limiting the opportunity to serve as a leader of an organization until one's junior or senior year would represent a significant departure from Cornell's existing model. Instituting such a change would make it much more likely that students first develop a better understanding of the broader university context, receive mentoring from more experienced students, and have the opportunity to experience both success and failures as members of their student organization prior to assuming leadership roles.

learn how to identify and apply their strengths to be better leaders, make ethical decisions, and enact change for the better. Colgate University, the University of Rochester, Elon University and Drexel University also offer centralized leadership development training for student leaders.

Recommendation G.2.2 – Advising of Student Organizations** Clarify expectations for advisors of student organizations. To the extent that more stringent expectations are placed on advisors, establish appropriate means for recognizing the service contributions of the faculty and staff involved.

Any changes that are adopted to the organization and management of student groups must keep in mind that many faculty and staff already feel overburdened.[33] Asking faculty to invest significantly more time and energy into advising student groups when such advising is not formally recognized is simply untenable. As one faculty wrote, *"At some point, we have to acknowledge that (largely due to budget constraints) we cannot continue to add additional layers of responsibility (instruction, administration, etc.) onto staff and faculty to keep this ship moving forward. We rarely have the discussion that something has to give in these situations."*

Problem/challenge to be addressed (G.3): Students indicated not feeling sufficiently recognized for their leadership on campus.

Although we heard many answers in response to questions about what type of support would address this need, the most common include the kind of structural and leadership support described above in G.2 as well as (a) formal recognition and (b) financial support.

Recommendation G.3.1 – Presidential-tier Student Organizations** Establish a "presidential" tier of student organizations for which there would be clear and rigorous requirements for eligibility that would limit the total number of organizations in the tier. Student organizations would need to continue to meet ongoing requirements to maintain their status,[34] but provided they do, the organizations would be eligible for special university-sponsored benefits.

For formal recognition, we should revise the management structure of student organizations to consider incorporating criteria other than budgetary ones to distinguish

---

[33] Currently, there are 913 undergraduate student organizations, of which 570 (62%) are advised by faculty, 190 (21%) by a Student and Campus Life (SCL) staff member, 152 (17%) by non-SCL staff, and 1 by a graduate student advisor. Of the 327 graduate/professional student organizations, 206 (63%) are advised by faculty, 5 (1.5%) by SCL staff, 115 (35%) by non-SCL staff, and 1 by a graduate student advisor.

[34] For example, in the initial year of certification, leaders who participate in the associated Student Leadership Academy would focus on developing strategic goals and an associated action plan for their organization. In subsequent years, rising leaders would critically evaluate progress against goals and learn how to assess the factors that facilitate and inhibit the effective implementation of those goals.

among tiers. The introduction of more reliable registration and reporting mechanisms (recommendation G.1) combined with leadership development training (recommendation G.2.1) would make it possible to identify those student organizations that embody the university's core values, are led by trained student leaders and committed advisors, and have a documented record of contributing to an inclusive campus climate, and designate them as "presidential tier" organizations. To the extent that there is a university-wide understanding of what is involved in meeting the standards of qualifying as a presidential tier organization, leaders of these organizations could receive more meaningful acknowledgement of their contributions in letters of recommendation, and similarly, advisors of presidential-tier organizations could also be formally recognized for their service.

Beyond this, however, students also expressed a desire to become eligible for special university-sponsored benefits. Examples include several benefits: (a) being featured in a "mentor matching marketplace" that is co-sponsored by Alumni Affairs and Development through which interested alumni can opt to support a student organization, both through mentoring and by providing financial assistance, if needed; (b) being assigned a professional staff person from Student and Campus Life who would provide ongoing coaching; (c) receiving national press; (d) obtaining an allocated budget that is provided by the university (rather than SAFC); and (e) securing grants for students whose need to earn money would otherwise preclude them from being able to take on leadership positions.

Recommendation G.3.2. – Student Leadership Awards* Develop university-wide student leadership awards to recognize students and student organizations that embody our values and have made visible contributions to promoting an inclusive campus climate.

Perhaps named the "Cornell Presidential Awards for Leadership Excellence," these awards should be prestigious and focus on recognizing students who have helped to transform our diverse campus community in positive ways. Awards should be given to recipients directly by the president at a university-wide community celebration (i.e., integrate these awards with recommendations from section A). In addition to the annual award, consider honoring students who had a positive impact on the community, with a "Student Leader of the Month" award.

Recommendation G.3.3. – Mechanisms for Developing Collaborative Solutions*** Sponsor an annual "Grand Student Challenge" hackathon.

In our outreach, we identified an interesting tension between the strong feeling expressed by some student leaders that they (and not the administration) are the ones who are developing solutions to meet the needs of students, and a lack of awareness among those students about already existing resources and initiatives on campus designed to address those very needs. We also learned about the challenges students

face in trying to understand and navigate our complex bureaucracy to get things done. These conversations led to the idea of sponsoring an annual hackathon (or other intensive brainstorming session) designed to unite the campus in trying to develop innovative solutions to campus climate challenges that have been identified as being a priority (e.g., through crowdsourcing). To enter, project teams would be required to meet certain guidelines (e.g., include students from diverse social identity and disciplinary backgrounds and at least one faculty and staff member). Winning ideas would be implemented by the university.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (G.4): Although student organizations provide a sense of social belonging for many students, this is not uniformly the case, as some student organizations are seen as a major source of exclusion and/or segregation.

In open-ended comments, 170 students mentioned positive experiences in student organizations in response to the question, "recall a time in your Cornell experience when you experienced a positive sense of belonging or inclusion." Deeper-level analyses revealed that conservative students and low-income and working-class students were less likely to mention student organizations as contributing to a sense of belonging for them.

Moreover, well over 100 students (across two task force survey questions) mentioned pre-professional organizations as being overly exclusionary, as evidenced in their very low (1-2 percent) new member acceptance rates. We also heard about these problems from student advisors and other staff throughout our outreach; even students who were members of these organizations attested to the fact that fairness is a problem. These concerns were significantly more likely among female students and students from working-class backgrounds. Illustrative comments include the following:

– "*…having access to them and free time to fully participate depends on already having stable financial resources*";
– "*Many clubs have application-based procedures run by the students themselves that favor students with connections to current members*"; and
– "*many clubs and organizations are closed-admission, and with incredibly homogeneous membership…the business groups for example are almost exclusively all-White or all-Asian, and unless you are White or Asian, you have a very slim chance of admittance*."

Recommendation G.4.1 – Staff Support for Student Diversity and Action Plans** To provide support to student organizations and to integrate their diversity and inclusion efforts with those of the broader university, we need to deliberately connect their diversity and inclusion plans to the university's overarching TND initiative.

At Cornell, students have taken the lead in recommending that student organizations adopt their own diversity and inclusion plan, in part to address perceptions about exclusivity and insufficient diversity. In 2014, the Student Assembly passed a resolution requiring all byline, performance-tier, tier 2 and tier 3 organizations to submit annual

diversity and inclusion plans (DIPs), and in the fall of 2017, the Greek Tri-Council similarly adopted a DIP designed to hold Greek chapters to a higher standard of accountability. Despite their good intentions, however, the SA's initiative failed to take root because of the lack of expertise among student leaders to evaluate the quality of DIPs and the effort required to properly monitor progress against stated goals.

The university must provide adequate support to student organizations to help them implement and sustain their well-intended DIPs. Integrating the student process with the university's TND initiative would make it easier for student organizations to receive coaching on what to do and how, including taking a more data-driven approach to assessing progress.

Recommendation G.4.2 – Recruiting Protocols for Selective Student Organizations*

Require student organizations that use an application process for admission to abide by "best practice" guidelines for how to manage their recruiting processes.[35] The guidelines should be developed by a group of students, guided by staff from Student and Campus Life.

Many individuals described the need for greater transparency and oversight of recruitment practices, with some pointing out that requiring selective student organizations to abide by guidelines to minimize discrimination would provide students with a realistic preview of how organizations in the real world operate. Although the specifics should be determined by a group that is convened for the purpose, our outreach suggests that a possible approach could be to categorize student organizations based on the selectivity of their admissions process into three types: highly selective, selective and open. Highly selective organizations would then be required to do the following: (a) offer information sessions in which they describe their selection criteria, which should also be available in written form following appropriate review and approval, and answer questions; (b) attend unconscious bias training similar to the training that is required of faculty chairs of search committees ("It depends on the lens"); and (c) publish recruiting scorecard statistics. Expectations for selective organizations could be less stringent and involve a subset of the requirements put forth for highly selective organizations.

Section H: Support for Diverse Staff and Faculty

Overview of what we learned

---

[35] This is less restrictive than policies that have been adopted at other institutions. For example, Princeton bans all student organizations from denying admission based on characteristics such as race/ethnicity, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, disability status, religion, or political orientation. They explicate that student organizations must be open to all students, and that participation can only be limited (with approval from the university) through talent-based auditions. https://odus.princeton.edu/activities/organizations/policies.

Continued investments in attracting and retaining diverse faculty and staff are critical for the success of the university in serving our increasingly diverse student body. Because the Provost Task Force on Faculty Diversity is exploring issues that are specific to faculty diversity, we focused more of our attention on staff diversity. Over the last four years, the overall annual turnover rate has remained stable; however, the turnover rate among faculty and staff of color has been increasing. Historically, people have attributed retention challenges to the fact that Cornell is situated in rural Ithaca.

We need to change this rhetoric and adopt a much more aggressive, systematic and proactive approach to address the key pain points experienced by faculty and staff of color.

Our outreach revealed the following to be among the most pressing issues: a) workplace climate that is monolithic rather than inclusive; b) need for more visible support for the professional development of staff; c) desire for more frequent and accessible university-supported initiatives for building a more collaborative community; d) disproportionate representation of staff of color in diversity-related positions and underrepresentation in upper-level, permanent (not interim) leadership roles; e) the much higher likelihood for staff of color to be hired into jobs in which the prior incumbent was also a person of color than into jobs previously held by a white staff member; f) lack of affordable housing in Ithaca; and g) difficulty in meeting personal needs within the local community.

According to data we gathered from the Office of Human Resources, approximately 70 percent of current incumbents in dedicated diversity and inclusion staff positions on campus are individuals of color, whereas they represent only 12 percent of total staff. These data are problematic to the extent that they suggest that many staff who have diversity and inclusion responsibilities are multiply marginalized by social identity-based hierarchies and the relegation of diversity and inclusion work within the margins (i.e., when it is not integrated into the core research and teaching mission). Yet they are key resources for the university; they need to be empowered and recognized.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (H.1): The need to lower disproportionately high turnover rates among staff of color and improve our success at increasing staff diversity through hiring (particularly into jobs that are not defined by diversity-specific responsibilities).

> **Recommendation (H.1.1) – Institutionalize Onboarding Practices*** Adopt a more purposeful and attentive approach to onboarding employees who are newly hired into Cornell.
>
> Recent data from the Office of HR Analytics show that employees' onboarding or orientation experiences are critical for developing a sense of belonging. In 2014, a new hire orientation guide was developed and piloted with a group of new employees. Within the first 90-120 days on the job, all new staff (not just those in the pilot) received an Acclimation Survey. Those employees who were part of the pilot were much more likely to agree that they "feel like they belong at Cornell" than those who were not part

of the pilot (100 percent versus 78 percent). Those who had reported a good orientation experience in their acclimation survey were also significantly more likely to have been promoted three years later.

Recommendation (H.1.2) – Involve Employees in Diversity Recruiting* Involve employees in efforts to enhance workforce diversity.

A notable finding from the 2018 Staff Acclimation Survey was that those who indicated they "knew someone well" at Cornell before coming to work here were also more likely to agree that they "feel like they belong at Cornell" (96 percent agreed compared to 70 percent who indicated they didn't know someone well). Unfortunately, only 26 percent of employees of color and 40 percent of women indicated they knew someone well before coming to Cornell as compared to 51 percent of white male new hires, which puts them at higher risk of experiencing difficulty in experiencing a sense of belonging.

These findings point to the potential value of having staff and faculty refer qualified friends to apply for jobs at Cornell, particularly for jobs that involve a national search. It is not uncommon for corporations to offer monetary incentives to employees for referring an individual who is ultimately hired. A common approach is to engage members of employee network groups (referred to as Colleague Network Groups at Cornell) in hiring and retention efforts.

Of course, members of our Colleague Network Groups are more likely to recommend Cornell as a place to work if they are happy with their own experiences. Toward this end, we asked members of the Men of Color, Women of Color, Disabilities, LGBT and Veterans Colleague Network Groups to describe an organizational change that would make them more likely to refer Cornell as a place to work. The recommendations around which there appeared to be the most agreement are included below.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (H.2): Staff who belong to minoritized groups desire a more formal mechanism for being heard and acknowledged by senior leaders in the central administration.

Our staff are key resources. However, because many staff who do diversity and inclusion work are multiply marginalized in higher education because of social identity-based hierarchies and the marginalization of diversity and inclusion work (i.e., when it is not integrated into the core research and teaching mission), senior leaders need to empower and recognize them.[36]

Recommendation H.2.1 – Access to Senior Leaders* Provide opportunities for Colleague Network Groups to interact with senior leaders (e.g., President Pollack, general counsel,

---

[36] These concerns are not unique to Cornell; this is something we heard in our conversations with diversity officers at peer institutions.

vice president for student and campus life, provost's staff, vice president for human resources) so that staff can feel confident that their needs and concerns are being heard directly (and not filtered through middle layers of management), and their expertise is visible.

Another mechanism for routinizing voice could be to designate a chair for each Colleague Network Group to meet with the UDC on a semi-annual basis.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (H.3): Staff uniformly expressed a desire for more professional development opportunities.

Recommendation H.3 – Professional Development Fund** Create a central professional development fund to which staff can apply for grants to support their participation in professional development activities (e.g., attend conferences, take courses not available at Cornell).

Problem/challenge to be addressed (H.4): Staff who belong to minoritized groups struggle to find a strong sense of community.

Ideally, staff and faculty would like there to be cultural resource centers for different identity groups, each with dedicated professional staff who advocate for their needs and provide the structural support and focused energy required for community-building, much like there are for students. However, it's important to first clarify the needs that staff expect would be fulfilled by creating these centers and consider whether there are alternative models for meeting those needs (e.g., the problems identified in H1, H2, and H3). When it comes to finding a strong sense of community, the challenges people experience extend beyond campus to the broader Ithaca community.

Recommendation H.4.1 – Support Colleague Network Groups* Provide more discretionary funds for the Colleague Network Groups to sponsor events and activities that help connect staff of color professionally and socially.

Staff offered numerous examples, including the following: social events co-sponsored by Ithaca College that provide opportunities to broaden social networks; organized bus outings to larger, more diverse urban areas for staff who may not otherwise be able to afford such trips; and a central campus location to host regular happy hours.

Recommendation H.4.2 – Ithaca Coalition for Community Diversity*** Launch a partnership – perhaps called the Ithaca Coalition for Community Diversity – with other large employers in Ithaca (e.g., Ithaca College, Ithaca City School District, BorgWarner) to develop shared solutions for developing a vibrant, full-service living community that appeals to diverse populations.

Such a community would ideally provide transportation, recreational and child-care services; include restaurants and food purveyors that serve multicultural culinary interests; and subsidized, mixed-use housing (i.e., for staff, junior faculty and graduate students).

Recommendation H.4.3 – Incentivize Minority-Owned Businesses*** Identify creative incentives that will dramatically increase the number of minority-owned businesses that can thrive in Ithaca and support the diverse community.

In addition to possible financial or tax benefits, Cornell is well positioned to offer businesses a range of services through its academic and outreach programs. Examples include community-engaged courses aimed at providing business development; business, legal and human resource consulting to businesses; incubator workshops through Cornell's entrepreneurship programs; and communication outlets to promote the businesses.

Problem/challenge to be addressed (H.5): Because of dramatic increases in the cost of housing within Ithaca over the last decade, staff are increasingly being pushed out of Ithaca into adjacent and less diverse counties. This is negatively impacting quality of life and intentions to stay.

Data provided by HR confirmed what we heard in our outreach efforts (particularly in our conversations with members of the Colleague Network Groups), that whereas 83 percent of faculty live within Ithaca, only 41 percent of staff and 26 percent of union employees live in Ithaca. Correspondingly, although only 4 percent of faculty live in counties adjacent to Tompkins County, a full 29 percent of staff and 43 percent of unionized employees do so. Interestingly, the proportion of staff of color who live in Ithaca is much higher (67 percent versus 41 percent overall); the same is true among unionized employees of color (68 percent versus 26 percent overall). These data show that living within the more diverse community of Ithaca is valued more highly among staff of color. However, since not all staff are able to afford the higher cost of living in Ithaca, there is no question that the success of our recruiting and retention efforts is being negatively impacted by the housing situation.

Recommendation H.5 – Housing Task Force* Convene a group to develop a range of possible solutions for improving the availability of housing options for diverse staff.

Examples of solutions to consider include (but are not limited to) the following: hosting an infrastructure to assist young professionals in finding potential roommates; supporting a carpooling network for employees who live farther away from campus and as a result spend more money on transportation and lose more time to commuting; lower or eliminate land-lease costs for houses that are situated on Cornell-owned property; and buy a block of apartments within walking distance to campus for lease to staff at more affordable rates.

Appendix 1. Findings from the 2013-2014 Study on Campus Climate

2013 Report on Student Climate for Diversity at Cornell

In 2013, Institutional Research and Planning published a report describing preliminary findings related to Student Climate for Diversity at Cornell based on data collected from the 2013 student surveys. This report was intended to inform a subsequent study conducted by Dr. Sylvia Hurtado of UCLA during the 2013-2014 academic year. Survey results revealed that differences in academic-oriented engagement by social identity were relatively minor, although there were large differences in student reports of diversity-related engagement based on social identity. Diversity-related engagement was defined as the frequency of positive and negative interactions with peers from different backgrounds. Included below are the figures representing notable identity-based results that were included in the 2013 report, together with comparative results from available subsequent results (from 2015 and/or 2017, depending on the question).

2014 Hurtado Report

During the 2013-14 academic year, the university commissioned Dr. Sylvia Hurtado to conduct a more in-depth assessment of campus climate at Cornell. The following represent some of the key findings and recommendations from that report.

Desire for greater dialogue:

- Students from diverse communities are interested in having more conversations, addressing the issues and listening to others – that is, deeper forms of "authentic engagement" that go beyond shallow attempts at addressing diversity. Common residential experiences like North and West Campus are natural sites for additional programming. The Intergroup Dialogue Project is a very promising avenue.

Diversity education and competencies:

- Students indicated that there was no diversity education follow-up to the *Tapestry of Possibilities* program during orientation (replaced by *Identity and Belonging Project* in 2017).
- Diversity awareness needs to be enhanced among students, faculty and staff.
    a. Diversity education should be required across colleges, along with better monitoring of what qualifies as a diversity course.
    b. Faculty development activities should provide support for inclusive pedagogies, activities and/or content that addresses diversity, with the potential of addressing these within faculty teaching portfolios for promotion and merit evaluation.
- Diversity-related competencies should be included in all performance evaluations.

- Students, faculty and staff should be educated about different forms of bias, discrimination and harassment to empower targeted individuals to "name" the offense and identify ways to respond.

Sense of community and belonging at Cornell:

- Students find their sense of belonging in very specific niches at Cornell, constituting comfort zones, areas of mutual interests, and personal goals. However, differences exist in the perceived legitimacy and access to resources among student organizations (e.g., Greek organizations versus cultural affinity and identity-based spaces) that perpetuate feelings of invisibility and exclusion.
- The *Toward New Destinations* (see below for more details) framework that was adopted by the University Diversity Council to enhance accountability should perhaps include requirement that units report more specific metrics.

The need for greater coordination among, and visibility of, diversity initiatives:

- The decentralized nature of the university can make diversity efforts feel uncoordinated across student and academic affairs.
- The visibility of initiatives being led by diversity-serving groups, clubs and organizations needs to be enhanced by implementing a common calendar of events or app, and more collaborations across these groups should be encouraged.
- Units, initiatives and individuals that are doing the most to create community and address diversity goals should be recognized and rewarded in a more visible way.

Responses to instances of bias on campus:

- The university's Code of Conduct should be reviewed to determine if it effectively addresses overt and subtle forms of bias.

When, at the conclusion of our outreach, we once more examined the recommendations that had been put forth in the 2014 Hurtado Report, we were struck by the similarity of our conclusions. The fact that the most salient challenges and opportunities that we identified mirror those from the Hurtado study provide support for the pervasiveness of these issues and also suggest that perhaps little has been done to implement changes based on the 2014 recommendations. Indeed, in our outreach, many individuals, particularly staff and faculty, asked about the status of the Hurtado Report, in particular whether the university had addressed any of the recommendations. If they have been, it is not visible to community members.

Appendix 2. A life cycle approach to reinforcing the university's core values among students, faculty and staff

Students	Faculty	Staff
1. **Recruiting materials:** Clearly depict core values using verbal and visual content and examples.** 2. **Admissions question:** Ask applicants to articulate how they personify core values.*** 3. **Orientation:** Create Intergroup Dialogue Project (IDP) workshops focused on dialogue and civic engagement* 4. **FYE programming:** "Living Where You Live" courses that highlight core values in action.*** 5. **Guiding framework:** Use for leadership development and standards for Greek and other organizations.*** 6. **Student recognition:** Offer prestigious presidential awards to individuals and groups that embody values to reinforce them.**	1. **Recruitment and orientation:** Introduce core values during the recruitment process and again during new faculty orientation at Cornell.* 2. **University faculty guidelines:** Imbue our guidelines with intentional messaging about how Cornell's core values shape our conceptualizations of "excellence" (e.g., in teaching and service, for tenure and promotion review).** 3. **Faculty recognition:** Launch the new presidential faculty excellence awards that align with our core values, in parallel with student awards.**	1. **Performance dialogues:** Include focus on explicating the "line of sight" between individual roles and the university's core values.** 2. **Employee goal setting:** Encourage staff to develop personal and unit goals that promote our core values.** 3. **Strategic planning:** Use core values as the building blocks for all strategic planning exercises.* 4. **University communications:** Continuously reinforce our values by making explicit connections to them in the stories that they feature.*

Appendix 3. The University Diversity Council

In 2012 the university made a strategic decision to forgo the Chief Diversity Officer model because of a concern that its highly visible but centralized placement was often not accompanied with the on-the-ground institutional leverage needed to effect real change. In its place, the university adopted a shared leadership model – the University Diversity Council (UDC) – which paired five senior executives who have key domain responsibility with direct report diversity experts, all under the direction of the president and provost.

Senior Executive	University Diversity Officer (UDO)	Population/Focus area
Ryan Lombardi, Vice President for Student and Campus Life	Vijay Pendakur, Dean of Students	Student and Campus Life
Lisa Nishii, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education	Adi Grabiner-Keinan, Director of the Intergroup Dialogue Project	Undergraduate Education
Barbara Knuth, Senior Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School	Sara Hernández, Associate Dean for Inclusion and Student Engagement, Graduate School	Graduate Education
Avery August, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs	Yael Levitte, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity	Faculty
Mary Opperman, Vice President and Chief Human Resources Officer	Angela Winfield, Director, Department of Inclusion and Workforce Diversity	Staff

All colleges and most major organizational units have their own diversity and inclusion advisory councils. The University Diversity Officers (UDOs) convene leaders from these diversity advisory councils each semester to discuss best practices, share issues of concern and gather input. In addition, each month, the UDOs host Diversity Community Meetings, which bring together professionals from across the campus to discuss issues related to diversity and inclusion on campus. The UDC has oversight responsibility for a number of university-level efforts, the primary one being the Toward New Destinations Initiative (see for more information; http://diversity.cornell.edu/toward-new-destinations).

Cornell University's Stated Diversity Goals

1. To continually improve on our demographic diversity
2. To promote a genuine sense of belonging for all members of the Cornell community. This includes specific efforts to do the following:
   a. Address campus climate issues at all levels of the university; and
   b. Reduce or eliminate practices that marginalize and exclude individuals.
3. To prepare all constituents for an interconnected, diverse world.
4. To utilize and leverage the diversity of thought, backgrounds and identities of our constituents for innovation and scholarly excellence.

Appendix 4. Toward New Destinations

Toward New Destinations (TND) represents the university's accountability framework for enhancing diversity and inclusion outcomes. Each college and major organizational unit is asked to establish annual goals related to the four core TND principles, and the UDC offers TND Grants for Innovation to support and enhance cross-unit collaboration toward the achievement of TND goals. Data related to the four core areas of the TND framework can be found at http://irp.dpb.cornell.edu/university-factbook/diversity:

1. *Composition* – the demographic make-up of the institution and its units, including among faculty, staff and students. Composition is assessed using admissions and enrollment student data as well as employee counts.
2. *Achievement* – levels of academic achievement or success of Cornell students, with a particular focus on eliminating differences in attainment associated with demographics. Achievement is assessed using data about retention and degree completion rates.
3. *Engagement* – involvement in academic, co-curricular and professional development opportunities. For students, this involves participation in learning opportunities such as internships, research and community service, and also captures levels of engagement across difference (e.g., engaging with diverse students outside of class) and with faculty. Engagement is assessed using data collected through student surveys.
4. *Inclusion* – the quality of interpersonal relations, climate and sense of belonging experienced by community members. Among students, inclusion is assessed using questions from student surveys about the university's commitment to diversity, sense of community at Cornell and satisfaction with one's social life.

Appendix 5. Participation rates in training offered by the Inclusive Excellence Academy (IEA) of the Office of Human Resources (92 percent of all participants are staff)

The breakdown of attendees by generation roughly corresponded to the breakdown of Cornell staff by generation, with millennials being somewhat underrepresented.[37]

Generation	Percent of Unique Individuals who attended one or more programs	Percentage of the Cornell Staff as a Whole
Millennials	19%	26%
Generation X	44%	41%
Baby Boomers	37%	33%
Traditionalists	Less than 1%	Less than 1%

The percentage of IEA staff attendees who are female (80 percent) was larger than the overall percentage of Cornell staff who are female (63 percent).

Gender	Number of IEA Attendees	Percent of IEA Attendees	Percent of Cornell Staff
Female	486	80%	63%
Male	124	20%	37%

The percentage of IEA staff attendees who are minority (20 percent) was larger than the overall percentage of Cornell staff who are minority (12 percent).

Minority	Number of IEA Attendees	Percent of IEA Attendees	Percent of Cornell Staff
No/Unknown	487	80%	88%
Yes	124	20%	12%

While the percentage of white female staff attending IEA programs (61 percent) was slightly higher than the overall percentage of white female staff at Cornell (55 percent), the percentage of white male staff attending IEA programs (14 percent) was markedly lower than the overall percentage of white male staff at Cornell (32 percent).

Gender	Number of IEA Attendees	Percent of IEA Attendees	Percent of Cornell Staff
White Female	375	61%	54.9%
White Male	87	14%	31.7%

---

[37] A number of possible reasons exist for the underrepresentation of millennials. As many millennials are just entering the workforce at Cornell, it is possible that they were not yet staff members during 2015-2017. The short tenure of many millennials at Cornell is another possible reason for the underrepresentation, as is the fact that more millennial staff are found in bands A-E, where the overall percentage of IEA attendees is lower.

Forty-six percent of IEA staff attendees were members of bands F and G, whereas 35 percent of Cornell's staff members are members of these bands. Seventeen percent of IEA attendees were members of bands H, I or No Grade, which is double the overall percentage of staff who comprise these bands (9 percent). Thirty-seven percent of staff IEA attendees were members of bands A-E, a lower percentage than the 56 percent of staff who make up these bands.[38]

Pay Band	Unique Individuals	Percent of Staff IEA Attendees	Percent of Cornell Staff
A-E	225	37.4%	56.0%
F-G	274	45.5%	35.4%
H, I and No Grade	103	17.1%	08.6%

---

[38] Percentages are based on actual numbers of staff in each of the colleges and units on Cornell's Ithaca campus and do not include staff at Cornell Tech in New York City.

Figure 1. Sample rubric for tracking and communicating progress against goals

Sample Progress Report

*Action areas would be listed instead as action items, at the level of specific recommendations.

Action Areas*	Increase Funding	Establish Working Group: Set specific goals	Make needed changes to current approach	Develop metrics/reporting System	Create advisory group
One Cornell	★	—	—	○	○
Diversity and Inclusion Action Plans	⇒	⇒	⇒	★	○
Communication Infrastructure	⇒	★	⇒	⇒	○
Diversity Education	—	★	⇒	★	★
Social Belonging	—	⇒	⇒	⇒	○
Student Organizations	○	★	○	○	○
Diverse Faculty and Staff	⇒	★	⇒	★	○

○ = Not yet started   ⇒ = In progress   ★ = completed   — = not applicable

Symbols in the table are for illustrative purposes only; they do not reflect reality.

Figure 2. Effectiveness of opportunities to learn about and/or interact meaningfully with different others

"Please indicate how effective the following have been for providing you with opportunities to learn about and/or interact meaningfully with people who are different from you"

1 = Not at all effective

5 = Extremely effective

● facilitated discussions   ● group project work
● impromptu interactions   ● multi-org activities

These survey results point to the following recommendations:

1) Create more opportunities for students to engage in "impromptu, informal interactions with people in my community." Examples in the report include community-wide events that celebrate Cornell's core values and a multicultural center that co-locates all the independent identity-based groups.

2) Provide faculty with a research-based "toolkit" on how to construct and guide project teams to enhance the interpersonal learning experience for students. Course-based projects groups are underutilized as an opportunity for students to get to know students from different backgrounds.

Table 1a. Awareness of and likelihood of using academic resources (undergraduate students)

	Advising about academic or curricular issues		Accessing academic help or tutoring		Meeting basic academic needs		Pursuing research with faculty		Reporting academic misconduct		Accommodations	
Are you aware of who/where to turn for support for the following?												
No	203	26%	245	31%	279	36%	347	44%	466	60%	398	51%
Yes	577	74%	535	69%	501	64%	433	56%	314	40%	382	49%
What is the likelihood of using that resource? (1 = very unlikely; 5 = very likely)												
# Answered	607		590		568		556		495		528	
Mean	3.75		3.11		3.64		3.58		2.57		2.30	

Tables 1b. Awareness of and likelihood of using professional development resources (undergraduate students)

	Advising about future career options and how to prepare for them		Finding summer opportunities		Requesting letters of recommendation	
Are you aware of who/where to turn for support for the following?						
No	288	37%	361	46%	414	53%
Yes	492	63%	419	54%	366	47%
What is the likelihood of using that resource? (1 = very unlikely; 5 = very likely)						
# Answered	575		550		530	
Mean	3.72		3.72		4.06	

Table 1c. Awareness of and likelihood of using resources for responding to bias (undergraduate students)

	Addressing experiences of sexual assault or harassment		Reporting bias incidents in the classroom		Reporting social/ behavioral misconduct or bias incidents	
Are you aware of who/where to turn for support for the following?						
No	435	56%	504	65%	495	63%
Yes	345	44%	276	35%	285	37%
What is the likelihood of using that resource? (1 = very unlikely; 5 = very likely)						
# Answered	508		486		489	
Mean	3.00		2.79		2.75	

Table 1d. Awareness of and likelihood of using other forms of support (undergraduate students)

	Making social connections; finding community		Talking about experiences of exclusion		Receiving support in making housing decisions		Securing financial assistance		Obtaining counseling (nonacademic)		Joining a student organization	
Are you aware of who/where to turn for support for the following?												
No	453	58%	565	72%	552	71%	471	60%	384	49%	327	42%
Yes	327	42%	215	28%	228	29%	309	40%	396	51%	453	58%
What is the likelihood of using that resource? (1 = very unlikely; 5 = very likely)												
# Answered	502		437		443		479		518		542	
Mean	3.45		2.63		2.69		3.17		2.94		3.94	

Table 2. Academic staff preparedness for responding to student needs.

Survey question: Please answer the following questions about how well prepared or equipped you feel to respond appropriately to students who present with the following needs (e.g., by knowing the resources to which you should refer them and how to do so; what you should say or do, etc.):

	Mental health issues		Family-related crisis		Emotional or social challenges related to their daily life experiences		Food insecurity		Financial troubles		Academic support		Reactions to current events related to diversity		Incidents of perceived bias or discrimination		Accommoda-tions for disabilities		Concerns about physical safety or violence	
Mean	3.11		3.13		3.19		2.28		2.30		3.41		2.94		2.90		2.99		2.67	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Not at all	42	7	48	8	37	6	190	30	164	26	47	7	75	12	68	11	85	13	101	16
Minimally prepared	134	21	117	18	119	19	211	33	229	36	67	11	127	20	146	23	131	21	197	31
Somewhat prepared	222	35	219	34	214	33	135	21	149	23	179	28	241	38	235	37	182	29	168	27
Prepared	195	30	215	34	221	35	80	13	79	12	265	42	151	24	149	24	179	28	141	22
Extremely prepared	47	7	39	6	48	8	24	4	15	2	79	12	43	7	34	5	59	9	25	4
Total	640	100	638	100	639	100	640	100	636	100	637	100	637	100	632	100	636	100	632	100
Combined "Prepared" & "Extremely prepared"	242	37	254	40	269	43	104	17	94	14	344	54	194	31	183	29	238	37	166	26

Table 3. Nonacademic staff participation in diversity workshops or training
Survey question: Have you participated in any training or courses designed to help you develop the awareness and skills you need to interact effectively with people of cultures and identities outside your own?

	Since beginning your employment at Cornell		Since starting your current role (if you have been in more than one role at Cornell)	
	Count	%	Count	%
No	257	19	342	26
Yes, but do not remember content	146	11	70	5
Yes, and still remember and use the content	913	68	682	53
N/A	29	2	203	16
Total	1345	100	1297	100

Table 4. Nonacademic staff preparedness for responding to student needs
Survey question: Please answer the following questions about how well prepared or equipped you feel to respond appropriately to students who present with the following needs (e.g., by knowing the resources to which you should refer them and how to do so; what you should say or do, etc.):

	Mental health issues		Family-related crisis		Emotional or social challenges related to their daily life experiences		Food insecurity		Financial troubles		Academic support		Reactions to current events related to diversity		Incidents of perceived bias or discrimination		Accommodations for disabilities		Concerns about physical safety or violence	
Mean	3.13		3.18		3.25		2.67		2.67		2.94		2.92		3.00		2.97		3.12	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Not at all	109	8	98	8	87	7	238	18	221	17	194	15	154	12	138	11	168	13	106	8
Minimally prepared	258	20	224	17	202	15	369	28	353	27	272	21	286	22	268	21	272	21	258	20
Somewhat prepared	409	31	429	33	421	32	351	27	419	32	369	28	447	34	436	33	401	31	420	32
Prepared	432	33	452	35	488	37	277	21	261	20	366	28	344	26	380	29	355	27	411	32
Extremely prepared	104	8	101	8	109	8	67	5	51	4	105	8	75	6	80	6	109	8	109	8
Total	1312	100	1304	100	1307	100	1302	100	1305	100	1306	100	1306	100	1302	100	1305	100	1304	100
Combined "Prepared" & "Extremely prepared"	536	41	553	43	897	45	344	26	312	24	471	36	419	32	460	35	464	35	520	40

Table 5. Academic staff participation in diversity workshops or training

Survey question: We would like to ask about your participation in workshops or training designed to address diversity issues in the classroom, in particular whether you have ever participated in any of the following recently enough to remember what you learned.

	Create multicultural, inclusive classroom climates that promote dialogue		Address sources of bias/prejudice in the classroom		Incorporate active learning pedagogies in the classroom		Teach effectively to students with different learning styles and/or disabilities		Recognize and support students in distress		Provide additional academic support to students who may need it		Respond to requests for accommodations from students with disabilities	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
No	338	52%	379	58%	293	45%	368	57%	295	45%	357	55%	347	53%
Yes, but do not remember content	67	10%	60	9%	45	7%	44	7%	58	9%	49	8%	39	6%
Yes, and still remember content well enough to apply it	251	38%	213	33%	318	48%	236	36%	296	46%	244	38%	263	41%
Total	656	100	652	100	656	100	648	100	649	100	650	100	649	100

Table 6a. Perceptions of equitable access to opportunities related to funding among graduate students
Survey question: To what extent do you agree that all students have equitable access to the following types of student opportunities:

	RA/GRA	TA	Fellowships	Summer Support	Conference Travel	Total # of semesters/years of support	RA in a residence hall	On-campus employment
Answered	354	381	358	339	347	337	193	243
Did not know	112	86	105	124	116	126	267	214
Did not know%	24%	18%	23%	27%	25%	27%	58%	47%
Respondents answered using a 1-5 scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree								
Overall Mean	3.70	3.81	3.35	3.65	3.90	3.74	3.82	3.81
Standard Deviation	1.28	1.23	1.41	1.26	1.18	1.23	1.12	1.19

Table6b. Perceptions of equitable access to research and other academic/learning opportunities among graduate students
Survey question: To what extent do you agree that all students have equitable access to the following types of student opportunities:

	Research with faculty	Access to faculty	Research grants	Access to resources needed to do research	Courses outside immediate department	Out of classroom learning opportunities	Study abroad or other int'l learning opportunities
Answered	309	353	319	340	379	294	290
Did not know	151	103	139	117	78	162	168
Did not know %	33%	23%	30%	26%	17%	36%	37%
Respondents answered using a 1-5 scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree							
Overall Mean	3.81	3.8	3.55	4.01	4.05	4.02	3.76
SD	1.167	1.16	1.307	1.089	1.06	1.05	1.26

Table 6c. Perceptions of equitable access to professional development and social/community involvement opportunities among graduate students
Survey question: To what extent do you agree that all students have equitable access to the following types of student opportunities:

	Mentor, advisor or advocate	Leadership/ professional development opportunities	Summer internships	Recognized ambassador for the major, college or university	Participation in professional student orgs	Participation in student orgs	Participation in affinity groups
Answered	371	357	309	248	339	355	300
Did not know	89	101	146	206	118	103	153
Did not know %	19%	22%	32%	45%	26%	22%	34%
Respondents answered using a 1-5 scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree							
Overall Mean	3.80	3.90	3.63	3.70	4.14	4.21	3.98
SD	1.22	1.18	1.30	1.27	0.98	0.93	1.14

Table 7a. Perceptions of equitable access to opportunities among undergraduate students
Survey question: To what extent do you agree that all students have equitable access to the following types of student opportunities:

	Participation in student organizations	Participation in professional student organizations	Participation in affinity student groups	Greek life	Research opportunities	Leadership development opportunities	Summer internships
Answered	609	581	426	559	570	554	581
Did not Know	20	46	190	67	52	65	46
Did not Know %	3%	7%	31%	11%	8%	11%	7%
Respondents answered using a 1-5 scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree							
Overall Mean	3.81	2.99	3.49	2.49	3.57	3.57	3.23
SD	1.23	1.39	1.21	1.43	1.21	1.16	1.32
% who responded "strongly disagree" or "disagree"	20%	42%	16%	56%	22%	21%	33%

Table 7b. Perceptions of equitable access to opportunities among undergraduate students (continued)

	Study abroad/other international opportunities	Out of classroom learning opportunities	Research assistantship	Teaching assistantship	RA in a residence hall	Ambassador/ mentor in major, college, university	On-campus employment
Answered	548	454	493	529	522	505	566
Did not Know	72	168	126	95	99	116	54
Did not Know %	12%	27%	20%	15%	16%	19%	9%
Respondents answered using a 1-5 scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree							
Overall Mean	3.48	3.72	3.59	3.61	3.89	3.69	4.04
SD	1.29	1.11	1.15	1.14	1.04	1.12	1.01
% who responded "strongly disagree" or "disagree"	26%	12%	17%	17%	10%	15%	9%